

A 1012 ~~1012~~ d 43
SHORT VIEW
OF
Mr. WHISTON'S CHRONOLOGY
OF THE
Old Testament,

And his HARMONY of the
FOUR EVANGELISTS

To which is added a POSTSCRIPT about our Rule for
keeping *Easter*, in Answer to the Dissenters.

By JOHN WRIGHT, M. A.
Rector of Kirton in Nottinghamshire.

Certainly there are some Cases wherein it is very difficult to forbear a little severity of Expression. And this I take to be one of them, which I have now before me. To see a Man who professes himself a Christian—to run down (impute endless Faults, Inconsistencies and Dislocations in) the most Ancient and Venerable Monuments of our Religion, might easily raise a Passion justifiable by the strictest Rules of Morality. Mr. Richardson's Canon of the New Testament Vindicated. Pag. 53.

L O N D O N :

Printed by Freeman Collins, for Edmund Parker, at the Bible
and Crown in Lumbar-d-street, near St. Mary Wolnoth's
Church. 1704.

A
SHORT VIEW
OF
MR. WHISTON'S CHRONOLOGY
OF THE
Ald Testament.

FOR UP
GELLIST
Is which is all about our Bible for
last 500 years



By JOHN WRIGHT, M.A.
Rector of St. Andrew's, Nottingham.

Certainly there are some Ques which I have now before me. To see a Man who professes himself a Christian, to run down the most ancient and venerable Monuments of our Religion, might easily make a Person sensible by the unjust Rules of Morality, Mr. Richard's Canon of the New Testament. Writings. p. 53.

Printed by Francis and John, for Richard Baskin, at the Golden-Tree, in St. Paul's Church-yard, near the North-Door.

TO THE
Right Reverend Father in GOD.

JOHN,
Lord Bishop of *Norwich*.

My LORD,

WHEN I consider the *great Veneration* all Ages and Nations have ever had for the *Sacred Records* of their *Religion*, it seems a surprising thing, that in a Protestant Kingdom, and in one of our famous Universities, a Person advanced to be a *Professor* and in Holy Orders, should dare to publish to the World, *That there are innumerable Errors, and much Confusion in several Books of God's lively Oracles deliver'd to the Jews, great dislocations in many Chapters of S. Matthew's Gospel; that S. Luke and S. Stephen report gross mistakes from the Septuagint-Bible in their Historical Narrations; and S. Paul other Matters from less Authority, and particularly a false Tradition from the Jews concerning the number of Years belonging to the Judges; and in the Front of all, to Dedicate such things to so Eminent a Bishop of the Church; and to mention your Lord-*

ship's constant readiness to Encourage, Assist and Patronize him in this Attempt for the Promotion of Learning and Religion.

My Lord, I need not tell your Lordship, that this gives a *dangerous stroke* at the *foundation*, and *certainty* of the *Protestant Faith*, (when so many faults appear in the *Holy Text*, and which we are told, are *endless*;) a great *advantage* to the Deists, and Men of loose and prophane Principles, against all *revealed Religion*, at a time when they are every where ready to *attack* these Sacred Writings; and in a word, tends to lessen their *Authority* amongst all sorts of People: So that were Mr. *Whiston's* Observations never so just, no judicious and sober Christian can have a good Opinion of them. But when they prove grounded upon his *own mistakes and half-studied Notions*; the Design will be counted Pious and Commendable in any one that can but take a Pen into his Hand, to *vindicate* the *Word of God*.

What I have done in this matter, and upon the other parts of his Discourse, I submit to your Lordship's severest Examination; who was pleased to approve of the Printing these Papers, if they contain'd any thing *clear* in them, when the Design was communicated to your Lordship near a Twelve-Month since. That Almighty God would preserve your Lordship for the Good of his Church, and the Defence and Protection of his Truth, is the hearty Prayer of

My Lord,

Your Lordships most Obedient

Servant and Kinsman,

J. WRIGHT.

OF HIS CHRONOLOGY.

THIS Author says in his Epistle Dedicatory, ' That ' till that great Man A. B. Usher Publish'd his Annals and Chronology, it was not over-easie to determine the bare Century when the Christians *Æra* began. If he means, it was not easie for *himself* to determine it till he had seen that Great Man's Annals, it may probably be true; but otherwise it was *sufficiently* known to all the Christian World many Ages before, that *Dionysius Exiguus* first introduced the Christian *Æra* from Christ's Birth in the *sixth* Century.

But to proceed, His Book begins with certain *Postulata*, or *Axioms* (as he calls 'em) as if he was about to Write a Treatise of Mathematicks, or at least that he would entertain us with nothing less than *Mathematical Evidence* in his following Discourses upon the Sacred Writings. And indeed his *pretended* Demonstrations are so many, and his Addition of Q. E. D. so *often* repeated, and sometimes where there is no just occasion, that it proves a *Comical Entertainment* even to many of those who respect his Book.

According to the Third *Axiom*, ' Every Writer is to be supposed to use the common Stile, Year and Computation of the Age and Nation in which he lives, without a particular Evidence to the contrary, That is, if he Writes of the Affairs of his own Nation we may expect it; but for an *English man* to write the Policy of the *Turkish* Empire in a Stile, Year, and Computation of Age not used among them is very ridiculous. And therefore this *Axiom* is afterwards *ill* applied by the Author to St. *John's* Writing at *Ephesus* of the *Jewish Government* in a *Roman Dialect*.

Of His CHRONOLOGY.

The 5th. of these *Axioms* tells us, ' That in the most ancient
 ' Ages of the World, when Men's Lives were about 800 Years,
 ' their Ability for Procreation must be supposed to begin full as
 ' soon as, (nay earlier and quicker, as he says, *page 72*, than) in
 ' these latter Ages, when the shortness of Men's Lives argue their
 ' Constitutions to be much more weak and infirm. And if from
 ' 14 to 60 be the time for Procreation in Males now, when Men's
 ' Lives are generally about 80, from the same 14 to 600 will be
 ' the time when Men liv'd to 800. Now this I confess is not on-
 ' ly a *vile* beginning of a Book, and no ways *justly* applicable to the
 ' later Times referr'd to in the ensuing Discourse, but *very improba-*
 ' *ble*, if not *directly false*. For Strength of Constitution proves
 not early Procreation or Ability for it, as is *manifest* to ordinary
 Observation : and the more long-liv'd Creatures, such as Lyons
 and Elephants (one of which last belonging to *King Porus*, is said
 to be 300 years old) come very late to generate, whilst the lesser
 Animals are sufficiently prolific. And therefore it is *far more rea-*
sonable to suppose that Men's coming to their Maturity should
 bear some Proportion to the length of humane Life in the several
 Ages of Mankind. And the Scripture *confirms* us in this Supposi-
 tion, when it speaks of the Age of *none*, when they begat Chil-
 dren in those earlier times, so very soon by far *much less* sooner
 than in our Days (as this *Axiom infers*) and most mentioned were
above 100 Years old then. And the early Maturity of the present
 Race of Mankind seems the most *probable* cause of the shortness
 of their continuance, according to that common Observation, *Qua-*
cito maturescant, cito pereunt. Besides, why must this Ability
 the Author mentions commence as soon or sooner in those times
 than in these, and yet cease so much earlier according to this Ax-
 iom, about 200 Years before Death ?

The next are his *Hypotheses* or Observations (as he *names* them)
 which he says, will appear strange, and yet are certainly
 true. Now here I do not desire to dispute with this Author a-
 bout Terms, tho' an *Hypothesis* used to be counted a *Supposition*
only which might be granted a Man, but was not capable of
 being proved. The design of the two first is to shew, ' That the
 ' Divine Revelation as well is for the Stumbling and Fall of
 ' wicked Men, as the Improvement and Salvation of the Pious ;
 ' and for this Cause God had put great Difficulties, and seeming
 ' Contradictions into those Writings, which are the only Authen-
 ' tick

tick Records of his Revealed Will. And so many Pages are bestow'd about the Unbelief and Disobedience of bad Men, and the Justice of God in concealing his Truths from them, as well as some Demonstrations of a Divine Goodness in this Conduct, that a Man would be apt to think that this Author had then forgot himself and his Chronology, and had fallen into the *Arminian* Controversie. But what he says in this Matter is so poor and scantling on that Argument, and so very common, that as he might have spared his Pains in writing it, so I shall be excused in sparing mine to examine it.

The 4th. Hypothesis seems merely a Whimsy of the Author, without any manner of ground, ' That the Sacred Historians exactly distinguish between the Reign of a King before and after his obtaining the Royal City, and between Reigning over *Israel* and over *Judah*, and over all *Israel*, and over all *Judah*, which he says will appear in the Chronology. But I cannot see it, or any Cause for it. For 2 Kings 8. 16. *Jehosaphat* King of *Judah* was King of all *Judah*, and Reign'd in *Jerusalem*. So *Abah* ^{1 King.} King of *Israel* was King of all *Israel*, and expressly call'd King of ^{22. 42.} *Samaria*, 1 Kings 21. 1. And in the same and the following Chapter call'd King of *Israel* again. As for *Abaziah*, he in his Father's Illness reign'd as much in *Jerusalem* as he did over *Judah*. And *Omri* who got the Kingdom of *Israel* by pieces, could not be said to Reign in *Tirzah* or *Samaria* till he did so.

The 6th. and 7th. Hypothesis, I shall put the Author in mind of afterwards. And the 8th. concerning the gradual Decrease of the length of Men's Lives, till they were brought down to 70 or 80 Years in the Days of King *David*, I know has been an old Observation; together with that Corollary of the Lives of the *Israelites*, being by God's Malediction brought to that Standard in the Wilderness thro' their Murmurings, who were to perish there in the space of 40 Years; and if any that came out of *Egypt* liv'd to 80, within that space allowed them afterwards their Strength or best of their Time was but Labour and Sorrow to them. Yet because this Sense of the 90th. Psalm seems forced and very remote, and the words more naturally to refer to the common Infirmities of old Age at that time of Life, I shall rather conclude that the Title of that Psalm was either mistaken or belong'd to some other eminent Man of that Name among the *Jews*, as late as the Days of *David*.

The second Corollary about the time when *Job* liv'd, is another Instance of this Authors Suggesting the most common things, and also without their just Advantages. *Eliphas* is indeed call'd a *Temanite*, i. e. (possib'y) the Son (at least of the Posterity) of *Teman* the 4th. from *Esau*. *Elibu* speaks of himself as of the^b Historian; ^b *Job* 32. and might be Son of that *Buz*, who was second Son, as *Job* of ^{15, 16, 17.} *Uz* the eldest Son of ^c *Nabor*, *Abraham's* Brother. The Greek ^{21.} Version at the end of *Job*, professedly from the Syriac Bible, ^d *Gen.* 36. makes him to be *Jobab Esau's* great Grand-son King of *Edom*, (and so *St. Aug.* in *Loc.* and *St. Ambr. ad Rom.*) and his Friends, ^{33.} *Eliphas* One of the Sons of *Esau*, *Bildad* the *Shuite* (from ^e *Shuah Abraham's* Son) and *Zophar* (*Zepho* another of *Eliphas* his Sons) to be three Neighbouring Princes. Many of which things our Author seems not to know; and yet these are but probable Guessees depending upon the Allusion of Names, and we cannot tell how remote some of 'em were from the Head of their Family. Some body, (whom our Author names not) says only, '*Eliphas* the *Temanite* seems to proceed from *Teman*, *Bildad* the *Shuite* is probably of the Family of *Shuah*; *Ram* was probably the same with *Aram*. But in comes this Man, and absolutely determines the Matter, 'That *Job* was contemporary with *Jacob's* Sons; that we are certainly obliged to place him no lower than he has done, he is abundantly assur'd, and (from Somebody's words) adds in Confirmation, That the same sort of Coin which was current in *Job's* time, is used too by *Jacob*, I suppose he means stamped Money. For (to assist this Author) *Gen.* 33. 19. *Jacob* bought a parcel of a Field קִשְׁטָה מָחָר for 100 Lambs; so the 70, *Chald. Samarit. Text* and Version, *Syr. Arab. Vulg.* and *Arus Montanus*. This *St. Stephen* declares was bought for a Sum of Money, and so our *English Translation* renders it; because the Stamp shew'd the value of the Coin to that Creature, whose Figure it bore, saith *Grotius*. And the same word is used, *Jos.* 24. 32. and *Job* 42. 11. Where all the ancient Versions render it, Lambs or young Sheep; but our's by pieces of Money for the same reason. And this seems to be the meaning of *Homer* telling us, The Golden Armour of *Glaucus* was worth 100 Beeves, and the Copper of *Diomedes*, worth nine; according to that common Adage about Bribery, There was *Bos in Lingua*. For *apud Athenienses nummi figura Bovum signati fuerunt*, says *Macrobius*, and that *pecunia* was to call'd, a *pecude nummo impressa*. Now if using stamped Money by

by several People and Nations, is a Confirmation that they are of the same Age, then we are all become Contemporaries with old *Jacob*. And by the same way of arguing, *Abraham* must be of a remote Age of the World from him, since Money went by weight in his time; for we read ^{2 Gen. 23.} of *Abraham's* weighing to *Ephron* 400 Shekels of Silver current with the Merchant. 16.

Here we come to the 17 Propositions. ' The first of which ' is to prefer *Ptolemy's* Mathematical Canon, as the surest and most ' useful Guide of ancient Chronology, where the sacred Histo- ' rians are silent. Which Canon I am not concern'd with, but only this Author's Chronological Accounts; tho' his learned Acquaintance gives but a discouraging Relation of the Method of it, ' That it computes the beginning of each King's Reign from ' the first Day of the first Month (call'd Thoth) of the Nabonassar- ' sear Year, which falls out in that respective Year of his ' Reign. And tho' any King should die immediately after ' the first Thoth, yet all the rest of that Year till the next first ' of Thoth is attributed to his Reign in the Canon. And if any ' King whose Reign was less than a Year, had never a first of ' Thoth within the compass of his Reign, that King was omitted ' in the Canon, and his Reign added to the Reign of his Prede- ' cessors. For by this means no one can tell purely by that Ca- ' non when any King began his Reign or ended it; nor how many Kings Reigned within the compass of it. And this Author plain- ^{h Page 56.} ly confesses, ' That the two first Years ascribed to *Cyrus* in the ' Canon, are by the Scriptures ascribed to *Darius the Mede*.

The second Proposition tells us, ' That the Jewish Year by the ' express Law of God was to be commensurate to their Seasons, ' and to begin always a few Weeks before Barley-Harvest. And ' the Lord said unto *Moses* and *Aaron* in *Egypt*, *This Month* (of ' *Abib*) *shall be unto you the beginning of Months, it shall be the ' first Month of the Year unto you.* And this by the consent of all ' has been the constant Computation of the Jews ever since *Moses* ' to this very day. That whether this Year be Solar or Lunar, ' the Julian Year is so near it, that it will supply its place well ' enough in the following Chronology. Well enough! This is a sorry saying for one that pretends to be exact in these things. And he gives so poor an account of the Jewish Years, that (for the sake of the Reader) I shall inform him that the Jewish Years were Lunary, consisting of 12 Months, or 354 Days, 1 *Nisan*, former- ly call'd the Month *Abib*, or of the First-fruits, and answers to our *March*

OF HIS CHRONOLOGY.

days	April	May	June
March (30)	2. Ajar or Zif. (29)	3. Sivan. (30)	4. Tammus
July	August	September	
(29) 5. Ab. (30.)	6 Elul. (29)	7. Tisri or Ethanim. (30)	8. Mar-
October	November	December	January
chesuan, or Bul. (29)	9. Chaslev. (30)	10 Thebeth. (29)	11 Shebet.
February			

(30) 12. Adar. (29) and reckoned their Months by New-moons, which falling short of the Solar Year 11 Days, every 3 Years they added a 13th. Month, and call'd it *Veadar* or *Adar* over again. (33.) Otherwise their Lambs would not have been ready against the Passover. Now before the Captivity at *Babylon*, these Months were only call'd, the first, second, &c. after their coming out of *Egypt*; unless sometimes *ratione appellativâ*, as the Month of *Abib*, i. e. *Primitiarum*, *Zif*, i. e. *amanitatis*, *Bul* i. e. *germinans*, *Ethanim*, i. e. *fortium*. But after the Captivity they brought the Names of the Months with them (as they did the Names of the Angels) *Nisan*, &c. And therefore we find none of these Names mentioned in the Holy Writings before *Hag. Zechar. Dan, Ezra, Nehem.* and *Esther*, who were in the Captivity. This Year was either Political or Sacred; the former began at the Autumnal Equinox when they supposed the World was Created, and belong'd to their Civil Affairs and Courts, and the Season before we find call'd the end of the Year, *Exod. 23. 16. When thou hast gathered in thy Labours out of the Field*: The Ecclesiastical, or sacred began at the Vernal Equinox, or rather the first New-moon next before or after it, when they were supposed to come out of *Egypt*, and according to this were their Feasts and Publick Worship stated. ' This our Author says, has been the constant computation of the *Jews* ever since. Which shews his *small skill* in History: For when *Alexander* came to *Jerusalem* in the 40th. Year of the second Temple, *Schindler* tells us that he obliged them to alter all their former Computations, and to begin their *Æra* afresh from the first of *October*, as the beginning of the Reign of *Alexander* over them.

But to make amends, our Author lays down this for his third Proposition, ' That the Years of *Jeroboam* after he drew off the 10 Tribes to Idolatry, are reckon'd in the Annals of the Kingdom of *Israel* but 11 Months only, and continued till the Revolution by *Jehu*, and no longer. And this Assertion, he says, will be thought

' thought by many, as strange and Paradoxical (and I do add, as
 ' *vain and ridiculous*) as it is new and singular. For whatever
 Whimfies *Jeroboam* may be supposed to have had, it is no ways
 credible that the Sacred Historian, Writing the Annals of the
 Kingdom of *Israel* would in so short a compass reckon by two
 different Calculations, and tell no body of it. But how does this
 Author prove it? Why, ' Every body knows what great variety
 ' of Years there has been in ancient Times (very true!) Our Julian
 ' Year is 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ Days (and he might have added, every 4th. Year
 ' 366) the Solar 365, 5 Hours, 49 Min. (here he should have said,
 ' and 12 Seconds) the ancient Roman Year before *Numa Pomp-*
 ' *ilius*, only 10 Months. I think a clearer account of these Years
 may be given thus, The Roman Years before *Julius Caesar* were
 Lunary, viz. 354 Days, and to make them agree with the Sun,
 the High priest intercalated a Month every 2 or 3 Years, which
 being kept secret, made him revered by the Vulgar, and often
 bribed to lengthen the Year by such as would continue their Offi-
 ces, or the Customs they Farmed. *Julius Caesar* being High-
 Priest reform'd the Kalender, and made the Year Solar *an.ab urbe*
condita 708. His Account supposes each Year 365 Days, 5 Hours,
 49 Minutes, 12 Seconds; but reckoning the overplus at 6 Hours
 to make up a Day to be added to the Leap-year, each Year is
 made too long by 10 Minutes, 48 Seconds, which in 134 Years
 will come to 24 Hours, except 6 Minutes, 12 Seconds: So that
 in 1668 the Sun had gain'd of the *Julian* Year 12 Days, and the
Gregorian wanted 2 of right. Acknowledging therefore a great
 variety of Computations of former Years, which is all this Au-
 thor intends; what follows? ' That *Jeroboam* by altering the
 ' Year, would not introduce a new thing, but only restore the
 ' ancient way of reckoning, and imitate all the Neighbour Nati-
 ' ons round about. And that it is very probable by the old Te-
 ' stimonies, as well as by the discovery of the true length of the
 ' Solar Year long afterwards, that the general Computation of the
 ' World was 360 Days, and no other. Was then *Jeroboam's*
 new Year 360 Days? How comes it then to be a Month shorter
 than the Solar, or its equivalent among the *Jews*? Or how
 comes his to be but 11 Months, and theirs 12? Why, ' it may
 ' easily be supposed, saith this Author, that *Jeroboam* might ap-
 ' point one of this sort to the People of *Israel*. One of this
 sort! when he had but just now told us, ' That *Jeroboam* restor-
 ' ed

‘ ed the ancient way of reckoning, which all the Neighbour Nations used round about, which was 360 Days to the Year, and no other. But if he means some moveable Year like it, whose Head in a short time would run thro’ all the Seasons, let him shew that any such thing was ever done by *Feroboam*; why he should be singular from all the rest of Mankind, and yet be said to imitate all his Neighbours; and why the Sacred Historian should reckon by those new *whimsical* Years in one part of his Annals of the same Kingdom, and never acquaint us why he does it so differently from all the rest. As if one Writing the *Roman* History from *Julius Caesar’s* time should compute some part of the *Roman* Emperors Reigns by the *Chinese* Chronology or the *Roman* Years before *Numa Pompilius*, and only one Person of none of the best Capacities should find it out. Which calls to my mind the purblind Man in *Erasmus’s Colloquies*, who could see the Tail of a Dragon in the Air, when his Companions of better sight could not, tho’ some of them believ’d him, because he said so. I know no prophane Historian that ever did, or would write thus. ‘ But according to our Author’s Chronology it ought to be so, and there are such Difficulties in the Reigns of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, as are inexplicable without this Supposition. I cannot help his *Ignorance*, but I know of none but what are explicable without it, and if they were not, I should rather let them continue so, than believe one that is much more *unaccountable*. ‘ But the force of the Reasoning, he says, will be better perceiv’d if we suppose an inquisitive Person who knew nothing of the *Julian* and *Saracen* Years should light upon an History of the Emperors of *Constantinople*, and *Mahomet’s* Successors in *Arabia* intervoven together: till he knew the different Epochaes of both Empires, he would be puzzled in adjusting their several Reigns; and this he takes to be just the Case before us. But by this Author’s leave, it is not the Case before us; for if this Historian when he Writes of the *Saracen* Emperors should generally reckon their Reigns by Lunar Years from the Flight of *Mahomet*, and for one considerable Period should reckon the Reigns of other *Saracen* Emperors by Solar Years from the Birth of Christ; or when giving an account of the *Grecian* Emperors, he reckons some of their Reigns by *Julian*, and others by *Saracen* Years, I should think the Historian was Mad, and Ignorant, and Fabulous. And *this* is the Case before

us.

us. As for the great Absurdities which he *fancies* in the Reigns of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, upon the common *Hypothesis*, I shall in the Sequel of this Discourse give such a *clear account* of all considerable difficulties relating to 'em, that we shall never need to hear more of such great Absurdities. ' But lastly, his ' Notion he says, is confirm'd from that Passage in the History of ' *Jeroboam*, 1 *King*. 12. 32, 33. That he changed the Feast of ' Tabernacles from the 7th. to the 8th. Month, even the Month ' that he devised of his own Heart. What then? ' The mean- ' ing of this Alteration, says he, may seem to have been this, ' That since the 7th. Month was famous for the *Jewish* Feasts ' and Solemnities, therefore to take as much as possible such ' things out of the thoughts of the *Israelites*, he abolish'd and ' eraz'd that whole Month for the future, and constituted the ' next to supply its place. As if changing a particular Feast from one Month to another, was to destroy and erase the former Month out of the Kalender.

The 4th. Proposition pretends to discover apparent Inconsistencies, both in Names and Numbers in the 2 Books of *Chronicles*, ' *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, which were written after the Captivity, ' when there was no Succession of Prophets to correct the Mi- ' stakes of Transcribers; that as to mistaken Names he will only ' instance in 1 *Chron*. 1. It being endless to go thro' all the Ex- ' amples of this kind; and as to Mistakes in Numbers, he will in- ' stance in some of the Principal. Now this is something strange, that there should be found such *abundance* of faults in these 4 Books, and yet *none* to be found in *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi*, who were *Esdræ σύγγενοι* and *Consilio adjutores*, saith *Grotius*, of the same time with *Ezra*, and of the Council with him. ' But our ' Author says, the different Case of the old Books, and of these ' last is just like that of *Horace* and *Cicero*; the one of which had ' all his Copies every where review'd and corrected by the Auto- ' graphon it self a thousand Years ago, and the other had only then ' its Autographon in the World. Here is a *woful blunder*, to speak of 2 Contemporaries, both famous Writers under *Augustus*; the one of which had all his Copies every where corrected by the Original, but the other had only one Copy in the World about 1000 Years ago. Neither is this purely supposed for Illustration, but *directly affirm'd*; and at best, is but ill expressed. I should rather have expected he would have instanced in *Horace* and *Hesiod*, or *Tully* and *Suetonius*, who liv'd at a considerable distance of time

from each other, and so were more applicable to the present Case; but thus it is, instead of *clearing*, to make things *worse*. Nor are we one jot the wiser for this Instance; for why may not the Writings of either of these Authors be as much freed from the Faults of Transcribers as the other? How comes one of these celebrated prophane Writers to escape better than the rest? Nay, tho' we suppose the Autograph of the other to be first brought to light some Centuries after the Authors time, they both had a beginning as well as the 4 Canonical Books of Holy Scripture which are before us; to which we must now return as much edified as when we left them. But there were no more Prophets left, and the Transcribers of the last Canonical Books were not now under the review of inspired Men, and there were no means of discovering and correcting their Mistakes afterwards. To which I give this plain Answer, That after the Sacred Canon was fixed, finished, and received by the whole Congregation, it is no ways probable that the latter Prophets should be corrupted sooner than the former. For all was copied out together into Authentical Copies for all the Tribes, by special Notaries, Scribes, Overseers and Witnesses. The Copies after diligent review taken were laid up by the whole Congregation in the Treasure house of the Temple under divers Locks and Keys, not to be touch'd but by Men appointed, nor to be used but with singular Reverence. To add, diminish, corrupt, or alter was *present death* by the Laws of the Nation. And under all their Calamities they ever conserv'd these *Writings* more than their own *Lives*, as we see in the Times of the *Maccabees*; after which the Masoretick Learning soon began, which made Critical Observations on every Word and Letter.

And now let us examine those apparent Inconsistencies, Errors and Mistakes in these 4 Sacred Volumes. Tho' to our comfort, no body among all *Jews*, *Pagans*, and *Christians* (that I have heard of) ever said so much of them before.

1 Chr. 1.

17. Meshech.
30. Hadad.
36. Zephi.
39. Homam.
40. Alian.
— Shephi.
41. Amran.
42. Fakan.
50. Hadad.
— Pai.

Gen. 10.

23. Mash.
Chap. 25. 15. Hadar.
36. 11. Zepho.
22. Heman.
23. Alvan.
— Shepho.
26. Hemdan.
27. Akan.
39. Hadar.
— Pau.

If I had been at the Man's Elbow when this was Writing, I would have pluck'd him by the Sleeve, and said, Do not put in *Fakan, Akan*; for it will betray your *gross Ignorance* in the *Hebrew* Language, in which *Jod* is ordinarily prefix'd to Proper Names, and as ordinarily omitted. Thus *Isa. 8. 2. Jeberechiah* in the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee* is written *Berachiah*, without *Jod* prefix'd by the 70, *Vulg. Syr. and Arabic* Versions, by the *Jews* themselves, and by our Saviour he is expressly call'd *Barachias*, and join'd by the Prophet with *Uriah* the Priest who was after slain. So 1 *Chron. 3. 16. Jechoniah* Son of *Jehoiakim* is writ, *Fer. 22. 24. Coniah* Son of *Jehoiakim* without *Jod*, and so in the *Hebrew* and *Chaldee*; but by the *Vulg. 70. Syr. & Arab.* with it.

And *Grotius* observes, *Orientales iisdem vocibus alios alias tribuisse vocales: unde in propriis nominibus Veteris Testamenti tanta varietas*, That the *Eastern Nations* variously assign'd what Vowels any had a mind to the same words, and hence came such variety in the proper Names of the Old Testament. It being sufficiently known that none of their Vowels were written down; for the Points were of late date, as were also the *Greek* and *Latin* Accents, and only to instruct strangers to pronounce the Language; they being not in any of the old Coins, and Medals, and Inscriptions of Antiquity for at least 500 Years after our Saviour's time. So that it is the same name whether we pronounce *Berechiah*, or *Barachiah*, *Zephi*, or *Zepho*; *Homam* with an e or an o; so *Jeshiah*, 1 *Chr. 23. 20.* is written *Isiah*, c. 24. 25. only by difference of a Vowel; thus the same word *אלהים* by the altering the pointings is read, *Mat. 10. 3. Alpheus*, but in *John 19. 25. Cleophas*,

as appears from *Mark* 15. 40. So *Haran, Charran, Ham, Cham, Sam, Shem*. And this is so notorious a Truth, that the 70 made ill use of this Liberty, and theirs being the common Bible in use in the Apostles times, the New Testament Quotations were to be examin'd by it, and so sometimes follow'd them in their Misconstructions of the *Hebrew*. Thus *Heb.* 11. 21. *Jacob* when he was a dying, blessed the Sons of *Joseph*, and worship'd upon the top of his Staff, because the 70 in their unpointed Bibles had read *Mattab* a Rod or Staff, for *Mittab* a Bed. So *Acts* 2. 24. Having loosed the Pains of Death, should be rendred the Cords or Bands of Death (for its Pains could not continue till the Resurrection) the 70 from whom this was quoted, not minding the Hebrew Pointings or Vowels of חבלי *per patach funes* from חבלי *per segol dolores*. Many Instances of this sort might be produced, were it my business.

In general, the Names of the same Persons may well differ in *Genesis*, and the *Chronicles* at so long a distance of time and place. *Quasi ignotum esset* (saith *Buxtorff*) *quibus mutationibus nomina propria pro diversitate seu regionum seu temporum exposita sint. Moses sequi potuit eam efferendi rationem quæ suis temporibus, Scriptor Chronicorum quæ suis itidem fuerit usitata.* As if it was unknown what alterations proper Names are liable to, through the diversity of Times and Countries. *Moses* might follow the way of speaking used in his time, and the Writer of the *Chronicles* what was used in his. And we see how our own Language has alter'd from the days of *Chaucer*. To which we may add, That nothing is more common than the different way of writing the same Name, as *Chirurgion, Surgeon, Isaiab, Esay, Nebuchednezzar, Nebuchedrezzar, Williamus, Gulielmus, Humpbridus, Onuphrius, Quirinius, Cyrenius* even in the same Age. So we read in *Bishop Stillingfleet's* Book about the Parochial Clergy, That in the Year 747 there was a Provincial Council held at *Cloveshoo* or *Cliff*. Here our Author would have told him of Inconsistencies, Errors and Mistakes. So *Gen.* 46. 10. *Femuel* and *Zohar* are call'd

• *Gen.* 46.

21.

Numb. 26.

39. v. 16.

42, 15.

Nemuel and *Zerah* in *Numb.* 26. 12, 13. • *Muppm* and *Huppm*, *Shapham* and *Hupham*; *Ehi* is also there repeated *Abiram* and *Ezbon*, *Ozni*, *Hushim*, *Shubam*, *Ziphion*, *Zephon*. So 1 *Chr.* 8. 31, 32. *Zacher* and *Shimeah* are written in the next Chapter, *Zechariah* and *Shimeam*, and 2 *Chr.* 21. 17. *Jeboahaz* is written also in the following Chapter, *Abaziah* and *Azariah*. So 2 *Kings*

15. 1. *Azariah* is call'd, v. 13. 30. *Uzziah*, and *Mattb.* 1. 9. *Ozi-*
as, which are (most of 'em) greater variations of Names than any
 this Man pretends to, and yet are no faults of Transcribers. And
 if the same Person be sometimes call'd *Mash*, and sometimes *Me-*
shech, one may very well be an abbreviation of the other, as *Pekah*,
 2 *Kings* 15. 25. was of *Pekabiah*, v. 26. And *Jakim* of *Jehoiakim*.
 Besides, in the *East* they had many Names, *Jehoiada*, 1 *Chr.* 8.
 36. is called in the next Chapter *Farah*. So 2 *Kings* 24. 6. *Je-*
hoiachin is called *Coniah*, *Jer.* 22. 24. And the King of *Babylon*
 changed *Mattaniah's* Name to *Zedekiah*, 2 *Kings* 24. 17. And chap.
 23, 34. *Pharaoh Necho* turned *Eliakim's* Name to *Jehoiakim*.
 So *Shishak* King of *Egypt* *Herodotus* calls *Sesostris*, and *Pekah* ^{p 1 King.}
 above-said is call'd *Mefan* by *Josephus*. And who by mistake ^{14. 25.}
 could transcribe *Jehoahaz* into *Johanan*? 1 *Chr.* 3. 15. Not to
 insist, that the same is practised all over *Europe*; the same
 Kingdom being sometimes call'd *Gallia*, sometimes *Francia*; *An-*
glia and *Britannia*. And this will hold not only in Titles and
 Offices, but in fix'd Names; the present Duke of *Bavaria's* Fa-
 ther being named *Ferdinand*, *Maria*, *Francis*, *Ignatius*, &c.

And since this has been the constant practice of the World, what
 an *Insolent Rudeness* is it in one who knows little of this matter,
 (as is plain) when he sees any thing of this kind in the Holy
 Writings immediately to cry out upon Falshoods and Inconsisten-
 cies in them!

' But says this Author, *Uz*, and *Hul*, and *Gether*, and *Mash*
 ' were the Sons of *Aram*, but 1 *Chr.* 1. 17. they are said to be ^{9 Gen. 10.}
 ' the Sons of *Shem*. Very good! *Aram* was their immediate Fa- ^{23.}
 ' ther, and *Shem* their Grandfather, the Head of their Family, and ^{1 Gen. 10.}
 Father of all the Children of *Eber*. *Aram* and his Sons are there ^{21.}
 fore rightly call'd the Sons of *Shem*, as, *Laban* was called Son of ^{Gen. 29. 5.}
 his Grandfather *Nahor*, and *Mephibosheth* of *Saul*; and as ^{2 Sam.}
Be- ^{19. 24.}
lah and *Ard* his Son are reckon'd the Sons of *Benjamin*. So ^{u Numb.}
Fair * the Son of *Segub* is call'd Son of *Manasseh* who was Father ^{26. 40.}
 to his Great Grandfather *Machir*, but Head of a Tribe. Thus ^{Gen. 46. 21.}
La- * 1 *Chr.* 2. ^{22.}
ban said, These Daughters are my Daughters, and Children my ^{Numb. 32.}
 Children. And both * Children and Grandchildren are said to be ^{41.}
 born to *Jacob* the Head of their Family then living, and all the ^{Deut. 3. 14.}
Jews affect to be called the Children of *Abraham*. ^{y Gen. 31.}

Again, 1 *Chr.* 3. 22. The Sons of *Shemaiah*, *Hattush*, and *Igeal*, ^{43.}
 and *Bariah*, and *Neariah*, and *Shaphat* fix. ' One of the Sons of ^{2 Gen. 46.}
 ' *Shemaiah* ^{15, 18, 22.}
 25.

‘ *Shemaiah* is here omitted ; for there are but 5 recounted, and yet sum’d up six. So *chap. 7. 3.* The Sons of *Izrahiah, Michael,* and *Obadiab,* and *Joel, Ishiah* five. Here the number in general is five, tho’ the particulars amount to no more than 4, one being lost in the Transcribing, This Man will have it the fault of Transcribing ; whereas we may very well read the former words thus, the Sons of *Shemaiah, Hattush,* and *Igeal,* and *Bariah,* and *Neariah,* and *Shaphat* (the next possibly not fix, but) *Shiffah,* and the latter the Sons of *Izrahiah ; Michael,* and *Obadiab,* and *Joel, Ishiah, Hamissah,* all of them chief Men. However the Father with his Sons made up each number. And for *1 Chr. 25. 3.* where he says, the Sum contains one more than the Particulars ; the former Answer will do, tho’ here is indeed a fault of the Transcriber, but it is this Author who has transcribed the Verse falsely, and has left out the first words of *Feduthun*, which plainly discover the whole Sense, that the Verse is very capable of being read of *Feduthun* the Sons, or *Feduthun’s Sons Feduthun, Gedaliah,* and *Zeri,* and *Jeshiah, Hashabiab,* and *Mattithiah,* six. And upon consulting the *Hebrew*, find that it is even so לִירוּחָן בְּכִי יְרוּחָן נְרִיָּהוּ The Sons of *Feduthun*, so *Lyra, Mariana,* and the Version of *Symmachus. Feduduthun, Gedaliah,* &c. there being not so much as ל prefix’d to the latter *Feduthun*, implying Of or To : Which I wonder our excellent Translators did not take notice of ; tho’ I do not wonder that our Author did not.

‘ Further, this Author tells us, *1 Chr. 6. 54.---60.* Here are but 11 Cities reckon’d up, and yet the Sum is 13, two of their Names, *Gibeon* and *Juttah* being omitted by the Transcriber. This Transcriber was a very bad Man surely to commit so many faults. But, *non fuit consilium* (saith *Bonsfrerius* a Learned Writer) *istius libri Scriptori rem hanc accuratè persequi, quæ aliunde posset si quid deesset, suppleri.* The Historian did not purpose to give an exact relation of those Cities, it being done already, but reckons up 11 of the principal, or what needed chiefly to be taken notice of in his time, and concludes, *v. 60.* as *Joshua* said, *All their Cities throughout their Families were 13 Cities.* The Holy Ghost using to speak short inknown Stories, as *Mat. 1. 12. Mark 1. 2, 3.* and more particularly, *Acts 7. 7. They shall come forth and serve me in this place,* was not spoke to *Abraham* as the rest of the words there mention’d, but to *Moses* 400 Years after. But saith our Author, the Transcriber has sufficiently perplex’d the whole Period : I cannot find where it is ; but I doubt somebody’s Head is sufficiently perplex’d.

Exod. 3.
12.

‘ *1 Chr.*

‘ 1 Chr. 6. 61. And unto the Sons of Kohath which were left of
 ‘ the Family of that Tribe were Cities given out of the half Tribe of
 ‘ Manasseh, by Lot, 10 Cities. Here says he, are 10 Cities given
 ‘ out of the half Tribe of Manasseh; whereas there were 4 given
 ‘ out of Ephraim, 4 out of Dan, and but 2 out of the half Tribe
 ‘ of Manasseh, ten in all, as we learn from Josh. 21. 20...26. The
 same answer will serve to this as to the last, *non est sensus*, says
Menochius, *decem urbes datas ex dimid. Manas. sed 10 fuisse urbes*
datas Caathitis, quarum due fuerunt ex tribu Manassis. There
 were Cities given to the Koathites out of the half Tribe of Ma-
 nasseh, says the Historian truly; but mentions not how many were
 given them out of that half Tribe, but only adds, by Lot 10 Ci-
 ties, *i. e.* they had by Lot 10 Cities in all, and so say all the an-
 cient Versions. Now as the Historian pass’d over a known pas-
 sage briefly; so all that are acquainted with the Hebrew Lan-
 guage, know it is so very concise, and to our Western way of
 speaking so imperfect, that there needs abundance of words in
 some Sentences to supply the Sense; and this any one may tell
 by opening an ordinary Bible where they may see numerous Ex-
 pressions inserted in a different Character to make the Original
 Hebrew intelligible.

‘ But in 2 Chapters immediately succeeding, we have the
 ‘ very same Genealogy (saith this Author) of King Saul’s family
 ‘ twice repeated, 1 Chr. 8. 33.--38. chap. 9. 39.--44. And if we turn
 ‘ to 1 Chr. 24. 23. we shall find the same Catalogue in two suc-
 ‘ cessive Chapters, and the Verses before and after this to be bare
 ‘ Repetitions on a Comparison with the foregoing Chapter, and
 ‘ sufficiently confused also. For Confusion I see nothing at all
 like it in the Verses before and after this last Quotation, but a re-
 gular, plain and concise account of the Families as could proceed
 from an Historian. And I appeal to any Person whatsoever to ex-
 amine whether these same Verses the Author mentions, can on a
 Comparison with the foregoing Chapter, appear to be but bare
 Repetitions. However, since these Repetitions are not pretended
 to be false, I know no such Inconsistency, Error and Mistake in
 the Historian, who describing the Original of Israel, and Judah’s
 Genealogies does upon different Occasions at some distance of
 place mention part of the same Family twice. And if he will but
 look on 2 Kings 15. 26. the very same words are repeated at v.
 31. following, to omit other places in both Testaments. And let
 me

me tell this Author in Answer to this, and all other such *Cavils* against the Holy Scriptures (what perhaps he never consider'd) That the Divine Authority of the Canonical Books is not diminish'd, or so much as concern'd in the stile or manner of Writing of the Penman. For as to these things, inspired Persons plainly differ according as they differ'd in their Education, Natural Parts, and Intellectual Improvements. So *Isaiah* one of the Royal Family (as the *Hebrews* affirm) writes in a most Majestick, Stately, and Princely Stile: When *Amos* favours of his Pastoral Employment, as the Water of the Mineral thro' which it passes. Who does not see and admire the distinguishing Learning of *S. Paul's* Education in his Epistles and Speeches above the other Apostles! whereas *St. John* the Evangelist is much remark'd for his frequent Repetitions. Hence it appears, that they compos'd and worded their own Inspirations, the Spirit of God taking care only so to oversee and direct them, that their words might not misrepresent their Matter. And let any Man that will contend this, make it evident by the Writings themselves without any further Arguments, the *Proverbs* to be the Word of God, and not the Book of *Wisdom*, and *Ecclesiastes* to be divinely inspired, and not *Ecclesiasticus*.

This Author goes on to alledge, ' That in *1 Chr. 9. 41.* where ' there is a Repetition of *Saul's* Family, *Abaz* is omitted in the ' Original, and so forced to be supply'd by our Translators. Now any one would be apt to think by this, that *Abaz* is not mention'd at all here in the Original. But looking upon the place, we find that he is insert'd in order with the rest, tho' not mention'd twice together, as in the foregoing Chapter; but the Sense is entire if the word be applied to either Verse, *he* (*i. e.* the very last named) or *Abaz* (that was the other Son already spoke of) begat *Jarah*: The supplying an *English* word for Explication does not sure imply a fault in the Original; for then we shall find more Faults in the Books of the Old and New Testament than our Author will be willing to own. Besides that supply might have been spared, one Chapter so near supplying the other, as *1 Chr. 24. 23.* (another of this Man's Objections.) And the Sons, *Jeriah*, &c. Now the Chapter before tells whose Sons these were. But he should have said, *Jeriah* the first, *Amariah* the second, &c. as it is in the foregoing Chapter; whereas it is barely *Jeriah*; and this is an omission in the Original. Which is as wise an Observation

tion as any I know, That if a Man's Title of Precedence be once given him amongst his Brethren, he must never be mention'd afterwards without it; whereas this is supposed many times for the future, tho' not always express'd, and the naming him here first of all implies it.

1 Chr. 22. 14. *Behold in my trouble, saith David (or of my Poverty) I have prepared for the House of the Lord an hundred thousand Talents of Gold, and a thousand thousand Talents of Silver.* This our Author thinks to be a lie. 'It was, says he, more

'Gold and Silver than the whole Earth had upon it, till the late 'discovery of the Mines of *America*. For my part, I do not know what quantity of Gold and Silver was then upon the Earth, any more than what is the present number of Mankind, tho' this Author pretends to know both; but I am sure, the learned *Brerewood* tells us, ^b That the Treasures of *Sardanapalus* exceeded this

vast Sum, and adds, ככר sign. planitiem, indeq; massam aliquam planam & pressam instar Placentæ (pressioris panis, saith *Schindler*) quæ formâ aurum & argentum servari in Principum thesauris consue-

^b De ponder. & pret. nummorum. cap. 6.

vit. That the original word for Talent signifies any Mass of Metal done into a thin Oblong Oval, like that of our Bookbinders Folding-stick with which they fold down their Sheets (as I rather explain their Sense) in which form Gold and Silver used to be laid up of old in Princes Treasuries, and at this day is much of this shape brought into *England* from the *East*, called the *Eastern Coin*; several pieces of which I have my self seen. And if this be the meaning of the place, as it very well may (since over all the *East* they keep unalterably to the Customs of their Ancestors, which they pretend to be derived down to 'em for above 3000 Years, and a considerable part of them I did once therefore purpose to have publish'd for the explaining some difficult places of Scripture) then the grossness of the Transcribers Mistake vanishes, and the *Confidence* as well as *Ignorance* of this Author appears. And we that know so little therefore of the true value of the ancient Coins, as well as of the Nature of many Fowls and Beasts, Insects, and Reptiles mention'd in the Holy Scriptures, should not immediately cry out upon Fallshoods and Inconsistencies, when the account of such things given us does not altogether answer to what we are acquainted with. However there are great variety of Talents mention'd in ancient Authors, which signified but a small Sum as we learn from *Brerewood* abovesaid, and the Talents

c Antiq. l.
7. c. 11.

named in this Text, may well be of the value of some of them. It is certain, they were not *Mosaick Talents*, since *Josephus* in the very place refer'd to by this Author, says, they were but the 10th. part of them.

But saith he, the Catalogue of those who return'd from the Captivity recited in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* are so widely different from Truth, and from one another, and the general Sums from the Particulars; and so full and complicated an instance of abundance of Mistakes of Transcribers in these Historical Books, written after the Captivity that he will search for no more. Very well, then he must be sure to remember this Promise; tho' I could shew him Instances of more moment to his purpose, and of greater difficulty. As to his Objection, *Ezra* 2. 64. the whole Congregation together was 42360, and so says *Nehemiah*, c. 7. 66. And tho' the particulars of neither amount to that Sum, yet probably some of the 10 Tribes might be at *Babylon* then, and return with them; for it is said, *Ezra* 2. 70. And all Israel dwelt in their Cities, and these might not be particularly describ'd, tho' in general sum'd up. And some of all sorts of these might not be registred with their Families; since we are expressly told, *Ezra* 2. 62. That the Genealogy of many was not found in the Register, but v. 64. The whole Congregation together was so many. And when *Nehemiah* came to make a Catalogue, several might be better known to what Families they belong'd; others might be dead.

2 I Kings
15. 33.

From these mistakes of the Transcribers, he saith, *Baasha* King of *Israel* is said to come up against *Judah* in the 36th. Year of the Reign of *Asa*. 2 Chr. 16. 1. Whereas *Baasha* dy'd in the 26th. Year of *Asa*, ten Years before. I thought he had but just told us, that he would search for no more Mistakes of Transcribers. However, he should have said, *Baasha* died in the 27th. Year of *Asa* but 9 Years before. For the Text plainly says, *Baasha* began to Reign in the 3d. Year of *Asa*, and Reign'd 24 Years; but this we'll forgive him. But how came he then up against *Judah* in the 36th. of *Asa*? Our Author shall answer this himself with his third Hypothesis, or Observation. The Sacred Historians date the Reign of every King from the first Exercise of his Supreme Power, tho' it happen'd in the life time of his Predecessor, contrary to the Custom of Prophane Writers: So that *Asa* might Reign some Years with his Father; the 3d. might also mean, of his Wars with the *Israelites*, for at first the Land was quiet ten Years. Thus

2 Chr.
41. 1.

Thus also *Abaziah* is said to be 42 Years old when he began his Reign, 2 *Chr.* 22. 2. upon his Fathers death; whereas but 2 Verses before, his Father was no more than 40 when he died, and was the Son 2 Years elder than the Father? And 2 *Kings* 8. 26. *Abaziah* was but 22 Years old at his Fathers death, and the beginning of his own Reign. Here are 2 notorious *Falshoods* of this Author, It is not said that *Abaziah* began his Reign upon his Fathers death, nor that he was but 22 Years old at that time. But in one place he is said to be 22 Years old when he began to Reign, and in the other place that he was 42 then. And our Author shall answer it again, That there might be an Interregnum of 20 Years till he was peaceably settled in his Fathers Throne. For he tells us in his 5th. *Hypothesis*, ' That the same Interruptions of Government, Interregna, and double Epochaes of Reigns are sometimes to be expected in the Annals of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, that appear in the Annals of other Nations. And we find there were now troublesome times, 2 *Chron.* 21. 10. the Edomites revolted, and so did *Libnah* at the same time, v. 16. 17. The *Philistines* and *Arabians* brake into *Judah*, plunder'd the King's House, carried away his Wives, and slew his Sons the Brethren of *Abaziah*.

But 2 *Chr.* 36. 9. *Jehoiachin* was 8 Years old when he began to Reign, 2 *King.* 24. 8. He was 18 Years old when he began to Reign, and v. 9. is accused of doing Evil in the sight of the Lord, and v. 15. three Months afterwards he had more Wives than one, which are certain demonstrations that the number in the *Chronicles* is corrupted in our present Copies. The first answer from our Author will do still, he was 8 Years old when he began to Reign with his Father, but 18 when by himself. Or, *Jehoiachin* was but 8 Years old, and so in a State of Minority when his Father was carried away to *Babylon*; but when he came to be 18 Years old, *Nebuchednezzar* suffered him to Reign 3 Months and 10 Days in *Jerusalem*.

In the Book of *Kings*, we find one mistake in our present Copies that are generally exact, 2 *Kings* 1. 17. *Jehoram* King of *Israel* is said to begin his Reign in the second Year of *Jehoram* the Son of *Jehoshaphat* King of *Judah*; whereas *Jehoram* King of *Israel* began to Reign over *Israel* in *Samaria*, in the 18th. Year of *Jehoshaphat* King of *Judah*, chap. 3. 1. Now we are got to the Book of *Kings* before the ceasing of Prophets, which will spoil all our Author's Arguments at once. For where were *Ezra*, *Nehemi-*

ah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachy that they did not see this fault in History? Why did they not correct this Mistake? Because they did not see it; for *Jehoshaphat* in the time of his Wars made his Son *Jehoram* Viceroy in his stead in the 17th. Year of his Reign, and at the latter end of his 18th. but in his Sons second Year, *Jehoram* King of *Israel* begins to Reign in *Samaria*, in whose 5th. Year after, *Jehoshaphat* makes his Son King in his own life time, and partner in the Government (*ex Casare Augustum* says A. B. ^{Chronolog.} ^{Usher}) according to the express words of 2 Kings 8. 16. ^{sacr. p. 6.} And in the 5th. Year of *Foram* the Son of *Ahab* King of *Israel*, *Jehoshaphat* being then King of *Judah*, *Jehoram* the Son of *Jehoshaphat* King of *Judah* began to Reign. And yet *Jehoshaphat* the Father Reign'd many Years after this, for he Reign'd 25 Years in *Jerusalem*, 1 Kings 22. 42. And this shews why *Jehoram* King of *Israel* is said to begin to Reign in the second Year of *Jehoram* Son of *Jehoshaphat* King of *Judah*. I thought at first, we might have had an answer ready from our Author's 4th. Hypothesis or Observation, ' That the Sacred Historians exactly distinguish between the imperfect Reign of a King which was generally before, and his compleat Reign which was generally after his obtaining the Royal City. In the latter case the Royal City is named, and the Phrase is, such a one Reign'd in *Jerusalem*, in *Tirzah*, or in *Samaria*, or over all *Israel*, or all *Judah*, &c. So then *Foram* the Son of *Ahab* had Reign'd some Years before, but he began to Reign over *Israel* in *Samaria* in the 18th. of *Jehoshaphat*, or the second Year of his Son *Jehoram*, as the Sacred Text tells us. But because this answer will not suit with the History, and so that Observation is good for nothing that I see; if the former account which the Context seems to require, be not fully satisfactory; since there are many possibilities of things, I shall rather suppose that *Foram* being a warlike Prince had the Government some time with or under his Father *Ahab*, and during the short Reign of his Brother *Ahaziah* who was afflicted with Sickness. For we read, 2 Kings 3. 5. That when *Ahab* was dead, no notice is taken of *Ahaziah*, but that King *Jehoram* went out of *Samaria* the same time and numbred all *Israel*.

And now since all the noise about so many Falshoods and Mistakes in the Canonical Scriptures amount to no more than so: If this Author was considerable enough, we might rationally expect that his Superiors should take him to task for publishing such

such bold Assertions, and *pretending* to find great Dislocations in St. Matthew's Gospel (of which hereafter) especially considering the great Scandal his late Theory gave about the Days of the Creation.

The 5th. Proposition tells us, ' That the entire sum of Years from the Creation till the Christian *Æra* is not concern'd in the greatest number of the Chronological Difficulties of the old Testament, and instances in 3 of its most famous Periods as secured to us by express and exact numbers from the Ingress into Egypt till the Captivity. But by his favour, the greatest Chronological difficulties are after this time, from the first of Cyrus to the Christian *Æra*, and so generally accounted. And tho' he tells us, ' That the first of these Periods from Abraham's departure out of Haran till the Exodus out of Egypt is punctually 430 Years according to Exod. 12. 40, 41. Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 Years. And at the end of the 430 Years, even the self same day all the Hosts of the Lord went out of Egypt. Here is not one word of Abraham's departing out of Haran; or that the 430 Years began then; nay, when we come to the Proposition relating to it, he will see that it did not; and himself to be mistaken in one of the main Periods of his Chronology. Nor is it so evident from Ezekiel's lying 390 Days upon his left side to bear the Iniquity of the House of Israel; that this doth expressly mean that it was 390 Years from the beginning of the Idolatry of Jeroboam, till the last Captivity of the Relicks of the 10 Tribes in the 23d. Year of Nebuchednezzar. I know this Author asserts it very dogmatically, both here and in his 14th. Proposition; but without any manner of proof pretended, otherwise than that it exactly agrees with his Accounts, and therefore is exactly stated, when if those Accounts be true, this may be falsely applied; but if neither be true, the Case is worse. I am sure this very Ezekiel in the next Chapter, explains this House of Israel to mean Jerusalem, which is set in the midst of the Nations and Countries that are round about her. And this House of Israel is Jerusalem, saith the Lord God. And Isaiah to the same purpose, I will place Salvation in Zion for Israel my Glory. And more expressly, Hear ye this, O House of Jacob, which are called by the Name of Israel. And therefore tho' Ezekiel in the first place refer'd to, sometimes mentions the House of Israel, and sometimes calls it the House of Judah (which yet may here mean the particular Tribe

Tribe of *Judah* which was the chief among them; or rather the Royal Family called the House of *Judah*, *Isa.* 22. 21. and particularly ¹ *Manasseh*, for whose Sins the Lord removed them out of his sight) yet he evidently means the same People; for the threatening is expressly of the Siege of *Jerusalem*, *verse* 7. and it after follows, *verse* 13. *Even thus shall the Children of Israel eat their defiled Bread among the Gentiles whither I will drive them.* Which could not be meant of the 10 Tribes who were gone into Captivity long before; and could not be capable of any Threatnings of the Siege of *Jerusalem* here mention'd, or the Consequences of it.

The 6th. Proposition says, ' That *Abraham* was born when his Father *Terah* was 130 Years of Age. Because it is said, *Gen.* 11. 32. That the Days of *Terah* were 205 Years, and *Terah* died in *Haran*, and *Chap.* 12. 1. The Lord had said to *Abraham*, get thee out of thy Country; so *Abraham* departed as the Lord had spoken unto him, and he was 75 Years old when he departed out of *Haran*; and ^m *St. Stephen* adds, that this was when his Father was dead. Now because this Author knows, that it was said before by *Moses*, *Gen.* 11. 26. That *Terah* liv'd 70 Years and begat *Abraham*, *Nabor* and *Haran*, he therefore tells us, ' This is one of the most material Points still in question with many excellent Chronologers. And I can say that it has puzzled all our Criticks to very little purpose, how to reconcile these 2 Texts. When it is but turning to the *Samaritan Pentateuch* which *A. B. Usber* got from the Remnant of the *Samaritans* in *Palestine*, and may be presumed to be that which they receiv'd from the Captiv'd 10 Tribes ⁿ when they first learned from them to worship the God of *Israel*, and is still written in the ancient *Hebrew* Character in use before the Captivity, and on very old Medals we find written in it, *Holy Jerusalem*; which could not be after the division of the 10 Tribes who then would not call it so. This excellent *Samaritan Pentateuch* says, *Gen.* 11. 32. that the Days of *Terah* were but 145 Years when he died, and then ^a *Abraham* was but 75 Years old at his Father's Death, and ^p born in the 70th. Year of his Father's Age. And so this matter is clear. But our Author (as it seems) not knowing of this, goes the old way, and will pretend to prove that *Abraham* was not the eldest Son of *Terah*, tho' he is named first; and so not born in the 70th. but in the 130th. Year of his Father's age afterwards. Which (by the way) seems

12 Kings
24. 3.

m Acts 7.
4.

n 2 Kings
17. 27.

o Gen. 12.
4.
p Gen. 11.
26.

seems very strange, that a Man should be said at 70 to beget 3 Sons, and yet that one of them (much more the first named) should not be born till 60 Years after. Surely the Women went very long with Child in those days. But let us hear him, ' In the first place, saith he, this is highly probable, from Gen. 5. 32. a ' parallel place, where it is said, Noah was 500 Years old and be- ' gat Shem, Ham, and Japhet; where Japhet who is last menti- ' on'd, was certainly the eldest of the 3 Sons of Noah, and so ' Haran who is last, may probably enough be the eldest of the 3 ' Sons of Terah. I answer, there is no necessary Consequence in this, that because it is so in one place, it should be so in another; nor so much as probability without other Reasons concurring. But how does it appear that Japhet was the eldest Son of Noah? ' By the order of each of their Posterity in Genesis and the Chro- ' nicles, where Japhet is set the first; which makes this some- ' what probable. As for naming the Posterity of either first, there is no great matter in it; it was done *ordine retrogrado*, says Vatablus, Moses began at the last Son first; but in both places Shem is set down before his Brethren. ' But saith our Author, by the best ' rendring of the Hebrew words concerning them in Gen. 10. 21. ' Japhet is stiled the eldest Brother. What he will count the best rendring, is no rule to me; but the Hebrew words are *אֶלְדֵּר אֶת יָפֶת* the elder Brother of Japhet. And so the Vulg. Syr. Arab. Samarit. Text and Vers. and the Targum it self (notwith- standing the Translator's Ignorance) render it. Or if we will trans- late the words as they literally stand; Japhet might be call'd the Great, because of some peculiar Eminency for which he was Honourable, or extent of Dominion; or a more numerous and powerful Posterity; or some other of that Name refer'd to by Moses, as well as upon the account of Age. ' But saith he, this ' is evident by the expresse Chronology of Moses before and after ' the Deluge, & compared together, which ought to determine us. Gen. 11. ' Noah was just 500 Years old when the eldest of his 3 Children 10. with ' were born, as we are assured by that Text we are upon. But 7. 11. and ' Shem was not born till Noah was 502 Years. For 2 Years after 8. 13. the Flood when Noah was 602, Shem was a bare 100. I wonder how this Author can write so; The Text we are upon, viz. Gen. 5. 32. does not say, Noah was just 500 Years old when the eldest of his 3 Children were born; but Noah was 500 Years old, and Noah begat Shem, Ham and Japhet. Nor does Gen. 11. 10. say that

that *Shem* was but a bare 100, but *Shem* was an 100 Years old and begat *Arphaxad* 2 Years after the Flood, or as the 70 translate the Dual *שני* in the second Year after the Flood. Both *Noah* and *Shem* might be well on in another Year at least; but within the 2 Years *Shem* was born, i. e. begot in the 501st Year of *Noah*, and born in the 502nd. And here our Author should remember his 6th. Hypothesis, or Observation, ' That even numbers of Years ' in the Chronology of Scripture do imply the space mention'd ' to be nearer to that number than to the next, either over or under, and will allow 6 Months more or less than is said, on either side, according to the most natural and strict signification of the words themselves. And the 7th. Hypothesis gives us more than we need, ' That this exactness of Numbers in the Chronology of ' Scripture does by no means hinder, but that the common liberty ' which all Writers take of using large and round Numbers without such Accuracy, may be allowed the Sacred ones also, upon ' other occasions where a greater exactness was no way necessary ' to the matter in hand. Thus 400 Years, a large and round number, may occasionally be used, tho' it appear by the Chronology ' delivered in other places more exactly to be 405, and this without any Prejudice to the Accuracy of the Sacred Accounts of ancient Times.

' But saith this Author, I shall now shew, Secondly, That *Haran* ' not only probably might be, but certainly was elder than *Abraham*. *Haran* was probably elder than his Brother *Nabor* to whom ' he gave his Daughter in Marriage. To this I cannot say there was any probability in it, without other Reasons; since some were a great while in those Days before they took them Wives. And why might not a Man then Marry a younger Person's Daughter? Many younger Brothers in our short time of life, have Children marriageable before the marriage of the elder. But what is all this to *Abraham*? ' *Sarai* is supposed to be the same with *Is- ' cab* the Daughter of *Haran*, else how could she be stiled *Abraham's* Sister, the Daughter (or Grand-daughter) of his Father, ' *Gen. 20. 12.* And if it be allowed, this makes it certain that ' *Haran* was elder than *Abraham*; since his Daughter *Sarai*, *Abraham's* Wife was but, 10 Years younger than her Husband. [Is supposed] and [if it be allowed] what Expressions are these, when we are promised *certainity of proof*? But it is not to be supposed, nor is it to be allow'd. For the very Text he grounds his

Suppo-

Gen. 17.
17.

Supposition upon, is a direct Proof against him, *Gen. 20. 12.* She is indeed my Sister; she is the Daughter of my Father, but not the Daughter of my Mother; which are so particularly express'd as words can do it, That *Sarai* was his Father *Terah's* Daughter by another Woman; and being his Son *Abraham's* Wife, she was as well stiled *Terah's* Daughter in law, *Gen. 11. 31.* as if she had been his Grand daughter. Neither is it at all probable without so plain a Text, That *Sarai Abraham's* Wife was the same with *Ischah* his Brother's Daughter; for then why should not *Moses* say so as he does in other Instances, *Gen. 14. 7. Enmishpat which is Kadesb, verse 8. the King of Bela which is Zoar, chap. 35. 6. Luz that is Bethel; so Ischah who is Sarai;* but names them one after the other as distinct Persons? Or why should *Abraham* be so particular as to speak of her being his Father's Daughter, but not his Mothers; and not rather that she was his Brother's, if she had been so.

Besides, saith this Author, *Haran* was certainly elder than *Abraham*; for about the same time that *Abraham* begat *Isaac* at the Age of 100 (which was then but the beginning of old age) *Lot* the Son of *Haran* is stiled old by his Daughters, *Gen. 19. 31.* Our Father is old, &c. Now we grow worse and worse. *Abraham* had the promise of a Son, *Gen. 18. 10.* When he was 100 Years old, and towards the latter end of the next Chapter *Lot* is said to dwell in the Mountain with his Daughters in a Cave. But we are not told how long *Lot* might have liv'd with his Daughters there before the Incestuous Original off *Moab* and *Ammon* happen'd. Does this Author think that what is Recorded in one Chapter must be contemporary with what is told in the foregoing, we shall then make but strange Chronology in the Holy Scriptures.

But *Haran* died in, *Ur* of the *Chaldees* before the removal of, *Gen. 11.* his Father and Brethren from thence, and therefore before *Abraham* was 75 Years of age. May be so. But we have no Instances of any body dying young till long after this time. Then this is the first. In short, nothing can be gather'd from *Haran's* dying first, that therefore he must be the elder, since this very Text says he died before his Father *Terah*.

His next business being to shew why *Abraham* a younger Son is named first, and this proving to be false and groundless: I shall not trouble my self with his Remarks upon it.

The 7th. Proposition tells us what every Person that has consider'd the place know, ' That the Period of the 430 Years sojourning of the Children of *Israel* is not to be confined to the space of their continuance in the Land of *Egypt*. But this Man cannot let things alone when they are well, but will be proving it, and that from the small number of Generations interposed between the entrance into, and the *Exodus* out of *Egypt* as that Interval he says, is exactly stated by the best Chronologers. ' Thus *Jochbed* the Mother of *Moses* was the immediate Daughter of *Levi*. If the best Chronologers told him so, they told him what was not true. For *Exod. 6. 20.* *Amram* the Grandson of *Levi* did not marry his Father's Sister, as is there translated, but 1777 his Cousin German: So *Syr. Vulg. 70.* *Arius Montan. Samarit. Text and Vers.* His Uncle's Daughter, and the *Chaldee* put out by *Arius Montan.* (with little difference) renders it his Aunt's Daughter. and the Masculine 77 is applied by *Jeremy* to *Hananeel* his ' Uncle's Son, and rendred by the 70, *ὁ υἱὸς ἀδελφῆς πατρὸς μου*, and by the *Syr. and Vulg. Patruelis*, Cousin German. *Amram's* Wife *Jochbed* is indeed called ' a Daughter of *Levi*, i. e. of his Stock or Progeny as *Christ* was the Son of *David*, of *Abraham*, and ' *Elizabeth* a Daughter of *Aaron*; and therefore the *Vulg.* renders it, *Accepit uxorem stirpis suae*, of his own kindred; and the 70 *καὶ θυγατρίων Λευὶ*, of the Daughters of *Levi*, as *Laban* said, *Gen. 31. 43.* *These Daughters are my Daughters, and Children my Children.* Nay, our Author himself but a few lines below says, ' *She-rab* call'd the Daughter of *Ephraim*, 1 *Chr. 7. 24.* was perhaps, (and I say certainly) but his Grand-daughter, and where he thinks it will serve his turn, *Gen. 20. 12.* Daughter must mean Grand-daughter of her Father. And tho' *Jochbed* is said to be born to ' *Levi* in *Egypt*; yet so are both Children and Grand-children said to be born to the Head of their Family then living, *Gen. 46. 15, 18, 22, 25.* But our Translation saying that *Amram* married his Father's Sister, deceiv'd a late learned Lord Chief Justice of the *Common-Pleas*; as he himself observ'd it was easie for all the Judges together to be deceiv'd, when the Question was to be resolved by Searches not common. This Author tells us twice over in the same Page (lest we should forget) that *Levi Moses's* Great Grand-father was 50 Years old at the descent into *Egypt*, but not a word who told him so, nor for what reason he says it.

See Vaug-
han's Re-
ports, page
162.

The

The 8th. Proposition is to shew, ' That the same 430 Years do
' commence exactly when *Abraham* was 75 years old, and depar-
' ted out of *Haran*, and could be in no other year. For this year
' is connected with the death of his Father at 205 years of age,
' and so the Chronological Series is continued, and a famous Peri-
' od begun, which else would be past over in silence. That in *Ha-*
' *ran Abraham* was in his own Country, and among his Kindred,
' and not sojourning in a strange Land, as *Exod. 12. 40.* in that
' date implies, that the Promise of the *Messias* to *Abraham* from
' whence *St. Paul* dates these 430 years, *Gal. 3. 17.* was certainly
' made to him at this age, *Gen. 12. 3, 4.* This is the plain sub-
stance of what he says. But who would think a Man should take
such pains to give *St. Stephen* the lie. For let any one mind, the
principal Text relating to this matter is *Exod. 12. 40.* Now the
sojourning of the Children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt was 430
years. This sojourning here means (as is agreed) the whole Pil-
grimage; the last place whereof was in *Egypt* whence they were
deliver'd. But it is not said nor implied that all the time of this
sojourning must be in a strange Land, as this Author affirms. For
it plainly began when God appeared to *Abraham* in *Mesopotamia*
before he dwelt in *Charran*, *Acts 7. 2, 3, 4.* And (there) said unto
him, Get thee out of thy Country, and from thy Kindred, and come
into the Land which I shall shew thee. Then came he out of the Land
of the *Chaldeans* and dwelt in *Charran* (which was some removal
out of his Country, and from his Kindred; however it was a be-
ginning of his Pilgrimage) and from thence when his Father was
dead he removed him. Before which removal God had said, *Gen.*
12. 1. וְאַתָּה דִּיכָרָת, i. e. in *Mesopotamia*, as *St. Stephen* expres-
sly tells us, Get thee out of thy Country, and from thy Kindred, and
from thy Father's House unto a Land that I will shew thee, And I
will make of thee a great Nation, and I will bless thee and make thy
name great, and in thee shall all Families of the Earth be bless-
ed. Which Promise of the *Messiah* *St. Paul* says was 430 years
before the Law was given, *Gal. 3. 17.* In *Charran* then the first
place of his sojourning after this Promise, *Abraham* liv'd 5 years,
for from his departure thence to the birth of *Isaac* it was 25 only,
as we read, *Gen. 21. 5.* When the 400 years begin according to
Gen. 15. 13. That *Abraham's* Seed shall be a stranger in a Land
not theirs, and be afflicted 400 years; from thence to the birth
of *Jacob* 60. *Gen. 25. 26.* thence to his going down into *Egypt*.

130. *Gen.* 47. 9. thence to the death of *Joseph* 71. *Gen.* 50. 22. compared with *chap.* 41. 46. and 45. 6. thence to the birth of *Moses* 59, and thence to the going out of *Egypt* 80, *Exod.* 7. 7. in all 430. Which 3 last particulars make up 210 Years from the descent of *Jacob*, and his Family into *Egypt* to their coming out, according to the *constant* Tradition of the *Jewish* Nation, and *clear demonstration* of the thing it self. And therefore to bring in a Corollary afterwards that the same sojourning is sometimes called 400 years in Scripture for roundness and evenness of the number, when it was really 405 is a *horrible bungle*, and not consistent with *truth*, or the *exactness* of the Sacred Chronology.

The 9th. Proposition lets down a plain Text of Scripture, *1 Kings* 6. 1. *It came to pass in the 480th. Year after the Children of Israel were come out of the Land of Egypt in the 4th. Year of Solomon's Reign over Israel, in the Month Zif, which is the second Month, that he began to build the House of the Lord.* And this Author advises every one by no means to lengthen this Period on any Pretence or Consideration whatsoever. And I do promise him I will not; but who would think that this Man should so soon as Page 84. *unpardonably forget* this very Text and Caution, which I shall there consider, and in the mean time pass on to his two Corollaries, The first of which observes from *Sir John Marsham*, 'That the Book of *Judges* does not make up an entire Series of 'Successive Chronology, but that some of the years of Slavery, or 'rest in one Region were collateral to others in different quarters of the Land, and that the *Judges* were not universal Monarchs of the whole People of *Israel*, but occasional deliverers of some parts of them only; and therefore sometimes contemporary to one another. This our Author says, is a wise, and just, and happy Observation. For the Wisdom and Justice of it I cannot see much, it being chiefly grounded on Conjectures and Precarious Assertions of which it is full; but for the happiness of it, I agree with this Author, since it has furnish'd him with an entire Quotation of 4 whole leaves together.

The second Corollary pretends to give the meaning of those words of *St. Paul*, *Acts* 13. 20. which he says, disturb him in the stating of the Period of the 480 Years before us. And when God had destroy'd 7 Nations in the Land of *Canaan*, he divided their Land to them by Lot, and after that he gave them *Judges* about the space of 450 years until *Samuel* the Prophet. Here says our Author,

Author, If the years of the Judges before *Samuel* be 450, this whole Period will be more than 480. Which I shall explain because he does not. That if we allow 40 to *Moses* in the Wilderness, 18 to *Joshua*, and none allow him fewer (except *Du Pin* who yet allows him 17) 450 to the Judges, 40 to *Samuel* and *Saul*, 40 to *David*, and 4 to *Solomon*; the whole will be (not reckoning the Government of the Elders) 592. And if we reckon the time of the Elders, or *Sanhedrin* who judged *Israel* immediately after *Joshua*, it will be more. And to that Solution of the number of 450 years, which adds the Years of the Oppressors to those of the Judges, it is liable to this further exception, That the 20 years of *Sampson* in which he judged *Israel* in the days of the *Philistines* are to be deducted out of the 40 years of their Oppression. To this very material Objection our Author says, 'I must own it to be my opinion that *St. Paul* in these words did only speak in general of such a number of years of the Judges as were usually ascribed by the *Jews* in his days to them. Now I confess the Apostles in their Expressions do sometimes seem to allude to the Legendary Stories of the Prophecie of *Enoch*, Ἀποκάλυψις Ἐνὸς cited by *Orig. contr. Cels. l. 5. Iren. 4. 30. Tertul. de Idol. & de cultu sœminarum 1. Clem. Alex. in Excerptis*, &c. and by the *Jews* in *Zohar*. And another Apocryphal Book call'd פטירת משה *Dimissio Moses*, *Grace Ἀνάληψις Μωσέως* mentioned by *Origen* and *Epiphanius*; both read in the Church in the Apostles times, and approved by the *Jews*, the former according to the Primitive Fathers principally treated of the Stars and their Vertues, of the descent of Angels to the Earth to entertain a Commerce with the Daughters of Men, of the Original of Giants occasion'd by this Correspondence, of things that were to befall the *Jews*, of our Saviour, of the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, the Dispersion of the *Jews*, and the last Judgment, and a world of Fictions on these Subjects; and the very words of *Jude 9*, saith *Grotius*, the other treated of the Contest betwixt the Devil and the Arch angel about the Body of *Moses*. And *St. Stephen, Acts 7. 53*. Speaking of those who receiv'd the Law ἐκ διαταγῆς unto the Disposition, or State, or Order of Angels, seems to refer to that parabolical Narration (for only as such were these Stories receiv'd among the *Jews*, saith *Buxtorf*) mention'd by *Dr. Lightfoot*, That all they who heard the Law utter'd by God from Mount *Sinai*, were by that hearing made like unto the Angels, that they should never have

have begot Children, grown old or died, but that the business of the Golden Calf turn'd them to sinful and mortal Men again. And our Saviour grounds his Argument for the Resurrection upon a false Notion the Jews then had, that God is no where in Scripture said to be any ones God while he was alive; and therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must in their Bodies and Souls somewhere else partake of that Benefit; as he immediately after argues with the Scribes about Christ, *If David calleth him Lord, how is he then his Son?* Which are only Arguments upon their Principles. The Apostles also fetch their Quotations out of the 70 Bible, because it was the only one then generally used, tho' in some places it is not an *exact* Translation. But to think that any inspired Writer should confirm a *lying* Tradition among the Jews is an *impious* Supposition. If they once broach Lies in compliance with that People, who can tell when they do speak truth? And therefore when they mention the 40 years Reign of *Saul* (which our Author instanceth in) the Names of the *Egyptian* Magicians, *Jannes* and *Jambres*, and many other things of this kind nowhere found in the old Testament, we have reason to believe they do it from a true Tradition of the *Jewish* Nation, or by the suggestion of the Holy Spirit. And that there were 75 Souls with *Jacob* and all his Kindred who went down into *Egypt*, we may be assured, because *St. Stephen* being full of the Holy Ghost says so, *Acts* 7. 14. Tho' all the Souls of the House of *Jacob* which *Moses* reckon'd up, *Gen.* 46. 27. of the Descendants into *Egypt* were but 70. And in Genealogies of the Holy Scriptures, how often are immediate Sons omitted? For thus *Moses* dividing his Genealogy of the Patriarchs from *Adam* to *Abraham* into 2 Decades, omits *Cainan* the Son of *Arphaxad*, which *St. Luke* Writing more at large supplies. As *St. Matthew* dividing his Genealogy from *Abraham* to *Jesus* into Tessaradecades says, *Ozias* begat *Joatham* who was the Son of his great Grand-son; Slipping over *Joash*, *Amaziah*, and *Azariah*. In all which Cases objected by this Author, I think it safer to acquiesce in the sense of a learned and pious Writer, *Crederet debemus Evangelistae id affirmanti: minusq; periculum est dicere, Hebraica exemplaria ex parte non haberi perfecta quam asserere in Evangelio errorem seu mendacium vel minimum reperiri*, That we should rather believe the old Testament Copies are in some places imperfect, than accuse the Evangelists and Apostles of telling Falshoods, or gross Mistakes,

a *Luke* 3.
36.

b *Tolet. Luc.*
3 annot. 61.

Mistakes, as this Author says, *Acts* 7. 14. *Luke* 3. 36. *St. Stephen*, and *St. Luke* do in their Historical Narrations. And therefore his Solution justly disturbs us more than the words of *St. Paul* do him, *Acts* 13. 20. Whose plain meaning I learn by a wiser and happier Observation of *Sir John Knatchbul*, than that he mentions from *Sir John Marsham*, *ὡς μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα* refer to *verse* 17. When the God of the Children of *Israel* chose their Fathers, and is directly translated thus, And after these things (or afterwards) in about 450 years he gave them Judges, beginning this date at *Gen.* 17. 19. When God established his Covenant with *Abraham*; whence to the birth of *Isaac* we may reckon near 1 year; thence to the birth of *Jacob* 60, thence to their going into *Egypt* 130, thence to their coming out 210, thence to their entering *Canaan* 40, and thence to the division of the Land 7, it will be about 448, and quickly after the *Judges* arise. But *Archbishop Usher* makes it from the birth of *Isaac* to this Division 452. The Apostle says, *ὡς ἔτεσι*, &c. about 450. Which also shews he did not mean any exact number according to the vulgar Opinion of the *Jews*, which this Author says, did punctually amount to this Sum.

The 10th. Proposition pretends to inform us, that since *Jehoram* King of *Israel* began to Reign in the 18th. of *Jehoshaphat* King of *Judah*, who Reigned 25 years in all; therefore in the 5th. of *Jehoram* when *Jehoshaphat* made his Son Partner in the Kingdom, this was about 3 years before *Jehoshaphat*'s death, and is exactly stated for so much in the Chronology, Page 86. and express'd to be clear 3 years. Now truly this may be so, if we could be sure that *Jehoram* began to Reign in the beginning of *Jehoshaphat*'s 18th. and *Jehoshaphat*'s Son at the beginning of *Jehoram*'s fifth. But for any thing this Author knows, both might begin at the latter end of the years mention'd, and then they may fall near a Twelve month short. Which tho' pardonable in an Historian who writes at large; yet where Chronology is stated to the very odd Months (as is pretended here) this is very precarious and may affect the whole Period.

His Corollary to this says, 'That it will be reasonable to expect some kind of Intimation in Scripture, when we allow the commencing of a Son's Reign before his Father's Death. I answer, This was so very ordinary in those times among all the Eastern Kings to make their Sons Viceroy during their absence in the

the Wars, and often to take them into a Partnership of the Government that *Grotius* says, it has much perplex'd the *Persian* Chronology, and it was so particularly usual in the Kingdoms of *Israel* and *Judah*, that we may many times well suppose it to be so, where it is not always express'd. Thus *c David* appoints *Zadok* the Priest, and *Nathan* the Prophet to anoint his Son *Solomon* King over *Israel*, and Proclamation to be made, *God save King Solomon; that he may come and sit upon my Throne, saith David; for he shall be King in my stead, and I have appointed him to be Ruler over Israel, and over Judah. And Jonathan tells Adonijah, Verily our Lord King David hath made Solomon King.*

c 1 King.
1. 34, 35,
43.

So *2 Kings* 8. 25. In the 12th. year of *Joash* *Abaziah* began to Reign, chap 9. 29. It was in the 11th. year of *Joash*, i. e. *Abaziah* Reign'd one year in his Father's life time, as was *Solomon's* Case. For when Fathers became unfit for Government, they placed their Sons on the Throne; as here, *d Abaziah's* Father was smote with an incurable disease in his Bowels 2 years before he died.

d 2 Chr.
21. 18, 19.

So *2 Kings* 15. 27. *Pekah* Reign'd 20 years, verse 30. is kill'd in the 20th. of *Joash*, yet verse 32. *Joash* began in the second of *Pekah*, and verse 33. Reign'd but 16 years, i. e. *Joash* Reign'd 4 years with his Father, and 16 himself; for verse 5. The Lord smote the King, so that he was a Leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several House. And *Joash* the King's Son was over the House, judging the People of the Land. But his 16 years Reign for himself began with the second of *Pekah*, and ended in the 17th. according to the express words of *2 Kings* 16. 1.

So *2 Kings* 13. 1. *Jeboabaz* begins to Reign in the 23d. of *Joash*, Reigns 17 years; yet in the 37th. of *Joash*, his Son begins, i. e. was made the Viceroy, and sav'd *Israel* from under the Hands of *Benbadad* the Son of *Hazael*, verse 5. and verse 25. He took again out of the Hand of *Benbadad* the Son of *Hazael* the Cities which he had taken out of the Hand of *Jeboabaz* his Father by War, 3 times did he beat him and recovered the Cities of *Israel*.

In the second Year of this *Joash* King of *Israel*, *Amaziah* the Son of *Joash* King of *Judah* becomes the Viceroy, chap. 14. 1. (for his Father *Joash* Reign'd 40 Years in *Jerusalem*, and this second of *Joash* King of *Israel* was but in the 39th. of it) he Reigns 29 years. Verse 2. *Joash* Reign'd over *Israel*

e 2 Chron.
24. 1.

14 of them, and his Son *Jeroboam* the rest, and yet *Azariah* succeeds *Amaziah* in the 27th. of *Jeroboam*, chap. 15. 1. i. e. *Jeroboam* Reign'd with his Father; unless we can suppose an Interregnum before *Azariah* was fixed in his Father's Throne, of which there is no appearance, since ^f *all the People of Judah took Azariah and made him King instead of his Father* at 16 years old. And if it be supposed that this being a State of Minority, his Reign might not possibly be dated from it till he afterwards took the Government into his own hands: Neither will this do, for 4 or 5 years more will not come near the 27th. of *Jeroboam*, if we do not suppose the date of *Jeroboam's* Reign to begin in his Father's life time. ^{f 2 Kings 14. 21.}

In most of which cases the difficulties of the place not otherwise solvable, and the common practice of those times are sufficient intimations of the commencing of a Sons Reign before his Father's death. And for what our Author says, 'That we ought not upon every difficulty to admit of double Commencements of Reigns, unless we find some Footsteps of them in the Histories or Prophecies of those times; which Rule he says shall be punctually observ'd by him in the following Chronology: Yet he tells us, Page 93. That his Chronology obliges him to place the beginning of *Hezekiah's* Reign before the death of his Father *Ahaz*, even where we have no particular intimation thereof in the Sacred History. And that this is the only instance wherein his whole Chronology allows of it, i. e. when it will serve his turn, he will make bold with his Rule, and then it was never but one time good Reader. But why this one time? Because the time which *Ahaz* survived was so small (being but a part of one year) as to afford very little occasion for any Historical Relations. Now whether there was any occasion or not for Historical Relations, this will not alter the beginning or end of a Man's Reign, which is an Historical Relation it self. Besides it was above a year; for 2 Kings 16. 2. *Twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to Reign, and he Reigned 16 years in Jerusalem.* chap. 17. 1. *In the 12th. year of Ahaz began Hoshea to Reign in Samaria;* (for it was so long before he was settled after the Slaughter of *Pekah*) chap. 18. 1. *Now it came to pass in the 13th. year of Hoshea, Hezekiah began to Reign, the Son of Ahaz King of Judah.* This third year then of *Hoshea* when *Hezekiah* began to Reign fell in the 15th. of *Ahaz* who Reigned 16 years, and

consequently it must be above a year before the death of *Abaz*. Which makes me think that this Man has forgot his *Vulgar Arithmetic*. However this Instance is another Confirmation of what is before me.

The 11th. Proposition infers from 2 Kings 15. 30. And *Hosea* the Son of *Elah*, made a Conspiracy against *Pekah* the Son of *Remaliah*, and smote him, and slew him, and Reign'd in his stead in the 20th. year of *Jotham* the Son of *Uzziah*: 'That this was in the 4th. of *Abaz*; for *Jotham* himself Reign'd but 16 Years in all, as appears 3 Verses afterwards. But because there had been yet no mention made of *Abaz*'s Reign, therefore the old Epocha of his Predecessor *Jotham* is still made use of. What Scandalous Chronology is this, to date it from such a year of a Kings Reign who was confessedly dead about 4 years before! But I have given so clear an account of this Instance under the last Proposition before I so much as saw this Passage, that I need not add any thing more about it.

The 13th. Proposition dates the famous 70 years Captivity of the Jews from the beginning of the Reign of *Nebuchednezzar* King of *Babylon* in the 4th. year of *Jehoiakim* King of *Judah*. And this Author adds, 'That the Correspondence is exact from this Captivity to the beginning of *Cyrus*'s Monarchy, when its Solution happen'd: It being by *Ptolemy*'s Canon compared with *Zenophon* just the space of 70 years. I am sure we read, *Zech.* 1. 12. That the Angel of the Lord said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on *Jerusalem*, and on the Cities of *Judah*, against which thou hast had indignation. *וְהָיָה שְׁבַע עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה* this 70th. year, i. e. this is in the 70th. year since. And the Lord answered good words, and comfortable, as there follow, for their Restauration, and that God was now return'd to *Jerusalem* with Mercies. Now this was in the second year of *Darius*, verse 7. who confirm'd and put *Cyrus*'s Decree for the Jews Reduction into Execution; and from the taking of *Jerusalem* under *Zedechias* was just 70 years as our Author confesses. Accordingly, *Zech.* 7. 1. They enquired in the 4th. year of *Darius* whether they should yet fast and mourn in the 5th. Month, as they had done these so many years, verse 3. even 70 years, verse 5. Which now were lately past, and better times began. This agrees with *Dan.* 9. 2. In the first year of the Reign of *Darius*, I Daniel understood by Books the number of the years whereof the word of the Lord came

came to *Jeremiah the Prophet*, that he would accomplish 70 years in the Desolation of *Jerusalem*. It seems *Daniel* who was in the first Captivity did find the 70 years should be now near an end, and upon his Prayer an Angel was sent with good tidings about it: Upon which Angels Prophecie, our Author himself premises, 'That the 70 years of Captivity were then ^{g Page} 199. upon the conclusion, at the end of which Term the Jews were to be restored to their own Land; to which determinate Period in the divine Council the Angel alludes. It is said indeed, 2 *Kings* 24. 3. Upon *Jehoiakim's* Rebellion, and the coming up of the *Chaldees* against him, Surely at the Commandment of the Lord came this upon *Judah* to remove them out of his sight. Not that this was already done (as our Author supposes) but the sacred Historian remarks that the coming up of those Enemies was certainly in order to it, and the beginning of those Sorrows which did not leave them till their final Captivity. The Prophet *Jeremy* also proclaims these 70 years Servitude to the King of *Babylon* in the 4th. year of *Jehoiakim*, *Fer.* 25. 1. And it was very near coming upon them; but he does not say, it must begin in that very year. And whereas this Author affirms, 'That the 70 years may have several Beginnings and Endings according to the several Captivities, tho' the Principal of them was Prophefied of by *Jeremy*, and began and ended then. This is not only new, as he calls it, but very whimsical to think that the Scripture speaks of several 70 years Captivities, or that the Prophet *Jeremy* should Prophefie of any other than what *Zechariah* and *Daniel* mention from him of the Desolations of *Jerusalem*, and the Cities of *Judah*, which (in their sense) commenced from the utter ruin of the Jewish Policy and continuance in the Holy Land. And this Desolation under *Zedekiah* is expressly said, 2 *Chr.* 36. 21. To fulfil the word of the Lord by the Mouth of *Jeremiah*, until the Land had enjoyed her Sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath, to fulfil 70 years. But the Land could not properly be said to lie desolate while it was inhabited by the Kings and People according to their old Laws and Government. This utter destruction of the Jewish Nation under *Zedekiah*, is also foretold by *Ezekiel* in the 5th. year of *Jehoiachin's* Captivity chap. 1. 2. (long after the 4th. of *Jehoiakim*) in such Expressions thro' the following Chapters, and particularly chap. 7. 23.

where the Land is said to be full of bloody Crimes, and the City full of Violence, as shew the main Body of the People were then reserv'd under the Type of a Chain for their miserable Captivity.

We have had already Postulata, or Axioms, Hypotheses, or Observations, Corollaries, Propositions, Scholia, and now we are come to his Lemmata; like some sort of Men who would vent off their bad Ware by giving it hard Names. These Lemmata he says, are preparatory Propositions, which falling within the 15th. main Proposition, we may call 'em lesser Propositions, or Lemmata within one great Lemma. But they being chiefly ground'd upon what has been already confuted, make the 2. E. D. so often repeated the more unnecessary.

I pass on therefore to the *Chinese* Chronology in the 16th. Proposition; to which he says, he must premise some more Lemmata; which may intimate to us some dark Traditions the *Chinese* might possibly have from the ancient account of *Noah* and the Flood deliver'd by *Moses*, which they applied to the Founder of their Monarchy; as most Nations in after times were willing to be Descendants from the ancient *Trojans*. But no ways make it probable that their King *Fohi* (if there was any such) was the same with *Noah*. For this *Fohi* in their own Chronology liv'd but 115 years, whereas ^h all the days of *Noah* were 950. Neither is it at all probable (what our Author supposeth *gratis* merely to accomodate the History to this *Fohi*) that *Noah* should live 235 years after the Deluge upon the higher Regions of *Caucasus* on which the Ark rested, and not descend sooner into the Plains where his Posterity are supposed to be already planted before him. Or, why should he and his Posterity be supposed, (for they are but *Suppositions* at best) to descend on that side the Mountain towards *China*, when we are told, *Gen. 11. 1.* That the whole Earth (or all People) were of one Language, and of one Speech; and they journied from the *East* and found a Plain in the Land of *Shinar* (directly *West* on this side those great Hills from *China*) and there they built the Tower of *Babel*; where Dr. *Rauwolf* says, he saw the remains of it, and that it is half a League in Diameter, but so mightily ruin'd and low, and so full of Vermin that have bored holes thro' it, that one may not come near it within half a Mile, but only in two Months in the Winter when they come not out of their holes. After which 'tis said,

^h Gen. 9.

said, Gen. 11. 8. *The Lord scatter'd them from thence upon the face of all the Earth.* And for any exact agreement of this History with the *Hebrew Chronology* which our Author speaks of, I see nothing at all like it, not only in the Father but in the Posterity. For this Author himself owns, that *Sem* and *Arphaxad* alone in the Scripture accounts, liv'd as long as 9 or 10 of the immediate Successors of *Fohi*. Neither will it make the age of these first Successors to *Fohi* suitable to those times of the World, should we grant (what we cannot prove) that the first Family of their ancient Kings were not Successive but Collateral in a different Province to those of some of their first Emperors, and that the second and third Families began about the same time. Tho' I can be sure that there was no successive Monarchical Government continued in those times. For upon the dispersion after *Noah*, tho' there was a Leader of the several Colonies, and after his death some Prerogative might be given to him who derived his Pedigree nearest from the first Founder of that Plantation, according to somewhat which *Thucydides* tells us; yet by reason of their Poverty and Dispersedness, each Plantation did not incorporate into one civil Government; but after they had conquer'd their Necessities, and the Ground affording them enough to spare, they fell to traffick and grew rich, and with their Dependants Reign'd as Lords over the poorer, and fell into petit Royalties: Whence we read of such a multitude of Kings in the small Territory of *Canaan*. But as this Man has managed the Proposition, it is such a *Complication of Inconsistencies, Nonsense and Absurdities* about this *Fohi*, *Vu Vam*, *Chim tam*, *Xin num*, *Hoam ti*, *Xao hao*, *Chuen hio*, &c. That I see he has more need of *Physick* than to be disputed with. And that which confirms me in this Opinion is not only what he adds here concerning the Reigns of Kings after the Days of *David* that they were generally of the same length as at this day; when there never was in any Age of the World any Rule of Comparison before or after *David* how long Kings do Reign: But in the next and last Proposition he pretends to tell the present numbers of Mankind upon Earth, which he says are 4294967296. By which any one would think that he is not only besides his subject, but besides himself. I never before took the Man to be a Conjuror, but if he can tell all the Births and Burials all the World over since the Creation, I am sure he is gone as far in that part of the Ma-

Mathematicks, the knowledge of Numbers, as any I know; and it is the fittest and only place in his whole Book to have inserted what he says in his Epistle Dedicatory. ' So I think I have done that which has not hitherto been thought possible. And if this were true, instead of the Honourable Employment which he says he has, he deserves to be Supravisor of the Polls, and might save the publick Charges of examining Registers.

We have nothing now observable till Page 84. unless his perverting i Judah's sense in refusing to marry Shelah his Son to Tamar his Daughter in law, which it is plain was (as she suspected) that he was afraid of ever venturing his Son with her, having lost two already: For he said, & Lest peradventure he die also as his Brethren did. Of the occasion of whose death it does not appear that he knew any thing, much less that a more grown Age would prevent that in the next which the present Judgments of God could not. But in this place we are come to, he says, ' The Foundation of the Temple was laid in the 4th. year of Solomon, and he Reign'd in all 40 years, and was immediately succeeded by his Son Rehoboam: So that if we deduct 3 years and a part of the 4th. from 40, we have 36 years and some odd Months from this Foundation to the beginning of the Reign of Rehoboam. But how many odd Months here or in other parallel cases are to be allow'd, is not generally taken notice of expressly in Scripture. And therefore he otherways collects that this Interval was 36 Years and 5 Months. Now the Text he had before him was the Subject of his 9th. Proposition, with a strict Caution not to alter it. This Text he refers to is 1 Kings 6. 1. Which plainly says, *In the 4th. year of Solomon's Reign over Israel in the Month Zif, which is the second Month, he began to build the House of the Lord: And 2 Chr. 3. 2. This was in the second day of the second Month; which consisting of 29 Days, the Interval just 36 Years, 10 Months, 27 Days, &c. E. D. quoth the Author. Nor can this be evaded by saying that this second Month Zif was of their sacred Year, and not of Solomon's Reign, since the Hebrew Text expressly says of it הוא החדש השני למלך שלמה על ישראל.* This is the second Month of Solomon's Reign over Israel, and so the Chaldee Paraphrase, and 70 besides the Versions of Symmachus and Pagninus.

It is said of *Amaziah*, 2 Kings 14. 5. That as soon as the Kingdom was confirm'd in his hand, he slew his Servants which had slain the King his Father. Which I thought meant only (by being confirm'd in his hand) that the Bustles and Troublesome Times were over, and he was now peaceably settled in his Father's Throne. As it is said of King *Solomon* after the Rebellion of his Brother *Adonijah*, that he strengthned himself, or was strengthned in his Kingdom. And *Jehoram* when he was set upon the Throne of his Father, he strengthned himself and slew all his Brethren with the Sword, who it seems were in opposition to him. And therefore the Father *Jehoshaphat* is said to give them fenced Cities, &c. but the Kingdom to *Jehoram*, because he was the First born. 2 Chr. 21. 3. Implying that there was some Contest among them, or at least that had it not been for his Birthright they should have had the Kingdom before him. In all which Instances our Author says, 'The words [confirm'd and strengthned,] mean that the Person was inaugurated again into his Kingdom, and so is a Foundation for a second Commencement of each of their Reigns after their Father's death, which they had begun before. Whereas, why may not confirm'd and strengthn'd, refer to former Difficulties and Oppositions. Or, what double Commencement of Reign, so as to make a different EPOCH in Scripture, or new Inauguration had *Solomon*.' Page 90.

In the case of *Hezekiah* who was born when his Father was scarce 11 years old, he instanceth for Explication only in *Mahomet* who married one of his Wives when she was but 6 years old, and bedded her in 2 afterwards; which he says is a more unusual Instance of an early fitness for Procreation than the former. Now if *Mahomet* had been but of that age then, he would have been more applicable in the case before us. For our Canon-law supposes Men to be of later Maturity than Women; *Legitimus consensus fœminæ in matrimonium in 12^{mo}. anno spectatur, viri in 14^{to}. Pubertas verò ex habitu corporis dignoscitur, si generare possint, licet minores 12 & 14 annis sint, & conjungi possint in matrimonio, malitia ætatem supplet.* Accordingly *Scaliger* testifies in *Civitate Lactoratensi Novem-populana puerum anno 12 minorem genuisse ex puella anno 10. minori.* Or if our Author had alledg'd, that this young Wife had any Children soon after, it would have been more to the purpose, and like to the *Indian* Girls who are married at 8 or 9 years old, and have usually Children at 10 in those Eastern Countries; but to say only Page 93.

only that he was bedded at those years can shew but the brutishness of that Impostor. St. *Jerom* gives us a fitter Instance, when he says, *Solomon non dum decem annos natus suo complexu nutricem filio Rehoboam gravidam fecit. In ep. ad Vital. Presbyter.* That *Solomon* before he was 10 years old, had his Nurse big with Child of his Son *Rehoboam*, who Reigned after him.

Of His HARMONY.

THAT the Evangelists did observe the general Order of Time, and the Series of the Actions of our Saviour's Life from his Birth to his Ascension, is not at all doubted; who yet might write Occasional Memoirs of many Passages relating to him, which began sooner, or ended later than that part of the Evangelical History where they are introduced. Of this sort our Author acknowledges is the Relation in the Gospels concerning *John the Baptist*, and adds, 'That St. *Luke* omitting the Discourse about casting out Devils by *Beelzebub* in his 8th. Chapter, because he intended to record another of the same nature in his 11th. afterwards, could not describe Christ's Mother and Brethren coming to him thereupon, but adds it after the other Discourses by the Sea that were some time that day afterwards. And has the confidence to say, That he has in his Harmony ventur'd to change that Order of the History which the Evangelist truly and originally intended. Thus the Story of *Judah's* Marriage, tho' it is told immediately after the selling of *Joseph* to the *Midianites*; yet was really connected with *Jacob's* return to *Canaan* after his 20 years Service to *Laban* the Syrian, according to *A. B. Usher* 11 years before. So *1 Sam. 17. 54.* *David* took the Head of the *Philistine* and brought it to *Jerusalem*, but he put his Armour in his Tent. And then the Inspired Writer begins a Passage that happen'd before the Fight, *Ver. 55.* When *Saul* saw *David* go forth against the *Philistine*, he said unto *Abner*, &c. Now this demonstrates what his first Proposition does not allow, That the Gospels both might and did consist of Occasional Memoirs no less than Methodical Annals.

a Page 99.

b Page

100.

c Gen. 38. 1.

d Chronol.

e Chap. 10.

The

The second *Proposition* pretends, ' That the several Branches of St. *Matthew's* History from the 4th. Chapter to the 14th. Page 110. 111. (which he calls 13 Chapters) not being very Methodical in point of Time, are misplac'd and out of order thro' those who did not perfectly know the true Series of the History, and so put the several Parts or Periods of this former part of St. *Matthew's* Gospel confusedly together, which were written at first separately and distinctly. Which he says, is certainly true of many Periods in the old Testament Histories and Prophecies. And by the *most daring attempt* takes St. *Matthew's* Gospel into pieces to restore their disorder'd Sections to their true places.

First, let us see these disorder'd places. ' The Sermon by the Mount, he says follows in St. *Matthew* immediately his first publick Preaching in *Galilee*: Whereas St. *Luke* assures us that it was not till after the Election of the Apostles near a year after this publick Preaching. Now in St. *Matthew* this Sermon follows his Election of the Apostles; and that this was a good while after his first publick Preaching in *Galilee*, St. *Matthew* plainly shews us. For (to use our Authors very following words) ' The vast success of Christ's Preaching, and his mighty Fame thro' all the Neighbouring Countries mention'd before this Sermon in St. *Matthew*, are good Evidence that a considerable time must have pass'd since the beginning of his Publick Ministry before this famous Sermon was preach'd by him. Again, ' St. *Matthew* writes, He went up into a Mountain, and when he was set, his Disciples came to him and he taught them. Whereas St. *Luke* says, he came down with his Disciples, stood on the Plain, heal'd great numbers, and there Preach'd this Sermon. That is, having chose his Disciples in the higher part of the Mountain, he came down and stood in the Plain, or opener part of it, heal'd many of their Diseases, and then sat down after the manner of the Doctors and taught them. What is there here misplaced?

2. The Voyage to the *Gergasens* follows after the healing Peter's Wives Mother: Whereas it appears by the other Evangelists to have been a full Twelvemonth afterward: Whence the History is undoubtedly very much misplaced. Now here St. *Matth* relates together things done at *Capernaum* at several times. For St. *Luke* 4. 31. says, He came down to *Capernaum* and taught them on the Sabbath days, and Vers. 39. Healed *Simons's* Wives Mother

Mother of a Fever; and when the Sun was setting which ended their Sabbath, they brought their diseased, it being held unlawful to heal while the Sabbath lasted. Again, Luke 7. 1. He entred into Capernaum, and a certain Centurions Servant was sick and ready to die. Both these Stories St. Matthew relates in his 8th. Chapter, because done in one place, and of a like nature: And adds Jesus's giving command to depart thence to the Gergasens, which St. Luke 8. 22. mentions as done there long after both the said Instances. Which is a clear proof both that the Verses in St. Matthew are not misplaced, and that this Evangelist did not write Methodical Annals.

3. The healing of the Paralytick, Matth. 9. 2. Was not indeed after the Voyage to the Gergasens, where it is placed: But neither does St. Matthew say so. But speaking of our Saviours coming then to his own City, mentions a Miracle that had been done there. And behold, are only the ordinary beginning of a new Period that now relates the Story. *Ecce rem denotat, non tempus*, saith Dr. Lightfoot.

f Poli Sy.
nop. in
Matt. 8.2.

4. The cure of Jairus's Daughter immediately follows the Discourse at Levi's Feast; *πῦτα αὐτῷ λαλῶντι*, as he was speaking, behold a Ruler, &c. Which he says, is an undeniable Instance of Dislocations, impossible to be got over; and from thenceforward he could not but conclude that this was the cause of the difference in St. Matthew from the other Evangelists. But he need not so hastily resolve, for the Discourse at Levi's Feast was ended with Ver. 13. Then came to him the Disciples of John, begin a new relation; the word (then) in ordinary Conversation being used as a Note of Transition from one matter of fact to another relating to the same Place or Person, tho' not immediately following in point of time and means only, after that, or afterwards. But if our Author will have it to mean, at that time, I'll turn to Page 73 of his, and he shall answer it himself. We must remember that altho' the words at that time, seem to refer us to the foregoing History, yet the Expression is of a much larger extent in the Language of Scripture, and includes a great space of time, as will appear by a view of the Instances in the Margin of that and the like ways of speaking both in the Old and New Testament. Nay, indeed it seems to be little more than a Particle of Transition, or common way of introducing and beginning a new Branch of an

Deut. 10.8.

2 King. 20.

1.

2 Chr. 32.

24.

Isa. 38. 1.

Matth. 3.1.

an History, just like the *English* Particle *Now*, as it is used at this day, which tho' at first it might infer a Connection in point of time with what went before, yet now 'tis plain it is frequently no more than a Particle of Transition to introduce a new Period after we have made a full end of that which went before.

Quomodo ab aliis est observatum (in die illa) sine determinata aliqua temporis notatione sedecies in Vetere & Novo Testamento esse positum. Usser. Chronol. chap. 11.

5. The Instruction and Mission of the 12 Apostles, *Matth. 10* follow the foregoing History of *Jairus's* Daughter, and so they do in *St. Luke*. But saith this Author, 'The second Journey to *Nazareth* at the end of *Matth. 13*. is to be interposed betwixt these 2 Periods. I answer, It is not so interposed in *St. Luke*, tho' it be in *St. Mark*. Which is a clear demonstration that the Evangelists do not tie themselves in their Narration of things to an exact order of Time; contrary to the Third Proposition. But this Mission, saith he, ought not to come in till just before the 14th. Chapter; and so on all accounts this History is certainly misplaced. I hope not, for if it must follow the second Journey to *Nazareth* to comply with *St. Mark*, it will differ from *St. Luke* who has inserted (besides the History of *Jairus's* Daughter) many Chapters betwixt them.

These Answers are directly applicable to the next Exceptions, That the Message of *St. John* the Baptist did not succeed as in *St. Matthew*, but precede the Mission of the Apostles: As also did the plucking the Ears of Corn, tho' *St. Matthew* tells 'em after, and the latter with this Notation, at that time, that the healing the blind and dumb did not precisely follow that plucking of Corn, tho' it is introduced with *τότε*, then was brought unto him one possess'd with a Devil blind and dumb; (tho' here his Exception is false in matter of fact; it being not told as precisely following it, for many passages of different times are mention'd betwixt them) and also that of *St. Matthew* 8. 2. *And behold a Leper came and worshipped him*; which tho' it did not happen immediately upon the descent from the Mount, yet *St. Matthew* could not have placed this Story better. For he had told us, *chap. 4. 23*, That *Jesus went about all Galilee; Preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of Sickness*; and having now finished his Sermons amongst them, he begins with his healing Diseases; and this was the first in that *Galilean* Journey. And no wonder that he proceeds to tell of the Centu-

rions Servant, and the curing *Peter's Wive's Mother* at *Capernaum* a City of *Galilee* in the same Chapter (of whom before.) And therefore it is not only of no moment, but *meanly silly* to alledge that *St. Peter* upon his first Election before the Sermon on the Mount, had a House, but afterwards none to receive our Saviour in, because he had left all and followed Christ. As if leaving a Man's House then to follow our Saviour was to void his Propriety in it: When *St. Luke* 5: 28, 29. says, *Levi* left all, all, rose up and followed him, and yet in the very next words, That he made our Saviour a great Feast in his own House afterwards. *St. Matthew* does also mention here while Christ is in *Galilee*, two Men there that would have followed him, whom *St. Luke* speaks of afterwards. And lastly, Christ's second coming to *Nazareth* is immediately set before the death of *John* the Baptist, which our Author says is misplaced, for the Mission of the 12 ought to have come between them. Then I fear, *St. Luke* will be thought misplaced; for he has besides the Mission inserted abundance of Miracles and Historical Passages from *chap. 4. 30.* to *chap. 9.* which *St. Mark* relates in other places, but not one of them here.

Allowing therefore that *St. Matthew* in some part of his Gospel did not follow the exact order of time, but wrote only Occasional Memoirs as the Subject Matter led him; I see no cause to complain of any Confusion, or one disordered Section, but that it was a consistent regular design of the Sacred Historian; especially when the following Evangelists both in this and in other Cases have supplied what the former omitted. Neither is it at all certain (what he says) that they wrote in those times (much less under the Old Testament Dispensation) in distinct Sheets separately, but rather upon an entire Volume which they rolled up, as we see the Pentateuch done in the *Jewish Synagogues*, and so might not be capable of being misplaced. However if *St. Matthew* did at first write upon several distinct Papers (or whatever they were written upon) it is no ways likely that he would leave them separate, so as to be liable to a Dislocation by a Transcriber; or that such a dislocation should not soon be taken notice of in all the Churches, and corrected by the Original, which is supposed to be kept many Centuries after; or that this should never be objected by the Adversaries of the Christian Religion when

when they saw such inconsistencies in History, which this Author thinks needs rectifying.

But saith he, All Antiquity affirm that St. *Matthew's* Gospel was written in the *Hebrew* Language. It may be so, and yet the *Greek* be the Original; and they who have supposed it to be but a Translation, have affirm'd that it was done by an Apostle or an Apostolical Person. Besides, it is not true, that all Antiquity affirm that St. *Matthew's* Gospel was written in *Hebrew*, but in *Syriac* according to *Papias*, *Irenaeus*, *Eusebius*, St. *Jerome*, St. *Chrysostome*, *Epiphanius*, and almost all the Ancients says *Du Pin*. And *Eccles. Hist. Not. Prelim. Hieron. l. 3. adv. Pelag.* this was probably the *Nazarenes* spurious Gospel of St. *Matthew*, which St. *Jerome* says was written *Syro Sermone sed Hebraicis literis quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni*. He tells us indeed that *Pantenus* brought the Original Gospel of St. *Matthew* with him out of the *Indies* which St. *Bartholomew* had left there among them, and that it was in his time preserv'd in the Library of *Alexandria*. But this in all likelihood was the *Nazarenes* Gospel which might pass for St. *Matthew's* because it pretended to be that: For why should St. *Bartholomew* leave an *Hebrew* or *Syriac* Book with the *Indians*? Or, if this Gospel was not the *Nazarenes*, it might well be some other Version of St. *Matthew's* *Greek*, and the rather because St. *Jerome* adds, that all the Quotations in it out of the Old Testament were according to the *Greek* Bible, which is not so probable in an Original *Syriac* Gospel. But for *Hebrew*, it is no ways probable that St. *Matthew* would write in that Language which few understood in our Saviour's time; whence there was such variety of *Chaldee* Paraphrases to make it intelligible. And because in their Synagogues they might not read but in the Original *Hebrew*: Therefore there was always an Interpreter stood by to Interpret what was read, and sometimes paraphras'd upon it, as *Jonathan* and *Onkelas* on the Law and the Prophets. And suitably to this practice did God sometimes raise up in the *Corinthian* Churches an Interpreter of the inspired Linguists. So in their Divinity Schools on the Sabbath days in the afternoon the Doctor who read the Divinity Lecture about some Dogmatical and Controversial Points concerning the difficulties of the Law, &c. whisper'd in the ear of an Interpreter in the *Hebrew* Tongue which he rendered in the Mother-tongue to the Auditory: The Mornings being spent in their Synagogues in Prayers, Reading of the Law and

and Sermons of Exhortation. Hence the Apostle distinguisheth between the different Gifts of Teaching and Exhortation in the Church. Now why should we think that St. *Matthew* would write in a Language that needed an Interpreter to the People? In short, St. *Matthew's* Gospel which we have in *Greek* has all the Air of an Original; translates like an Author the *Syriac* Expressions (which in the New Testament Dialect are called *Hebrew*, because of their nearness to it more than the *Chaldee*) in all the Quotations makes use of the *Greek* Bible; is written in the same Language with the rest of the New Testament, being now become the most general by the Victories of *Alexander*, whose part is directed to the *Hebrews* and *Romans*; has been received into the Sacred Canon by all the Christian Churches from the very first, as we now have it, without any Exception; all the Quotations of the Fathers were according to it; and *Origen* and St. *Jerome* corrected their Copies by it. But now an *Upstart* comes and says, They were all mistaken, St. *Matthew's* Gospel is very much misplaced, confused, and irregular, and he'll undertake to put it better together again. I am sure he had more need to study more what he professes, than in these times how to find faults in the Sacred Books of the Old and New Testament, and to new place the Verses of several Chapters, contrary as he owns to the Notes of time as they now lie.

*Page 112.

The third Proposition says, 'The four Evangelists (even St. *Matthew* now he is restored to his first designed Method) do all exactly observe the Order of Time thro' their whole Histories. In answer to which I shall not insist on those several Parables, and considerable Parts of our Saviour's Sermons which one Evangelist sets down before, and others *verbatim* after some remarkable Period; because our Author alledges that where the same Occasions offer'd themselves, Christ generally used the same Conduct, and Management both as to his Words and Actions. By which he thinks he is safe against all particular Proofs to the contrary; for it is but saying, the things were said or done twice over. Neither shall I need after what has been said, to compare all the Evangelists Narrations. But since he tells us that St. *Luke* and St. *Mark* do every where agree in the Series of their History, I shall compare some few Chapters of each with which this Discourse has lately concern'd me.

There

There came then his Brethren and his Mother, and } standing without sent unto him.	Mark 3. 31.
Behold there went out a sower to sow. _____	4. 3.
The same day when the Even was come, he stilleth the } Tempest at Sea after he was awakened.	4. 35.
He healeth <i>Fairus's</i> Daughter. _____	5. 42.
He is contemn'd of his Country-men. _____	6. 1, 2.
The Mission of the Apostles. _____	6. 7.
A Sower went out to Sow. _____	Luke 8. 5.
Then came to him his Mother and Brethren, and could } not come at him for the press.	8. 19.
On a certain day the Storm at Sea happen'd, and the } Disciples awakened him.	8. 22.
He is contemn'd of his Country-men. _____	4. 16.
He healeth <i>Fairus's</i> Daughter. _____	8. 55.
The Mission of the Apostles. _____	9. 1.

If he can say that these two Accounts within so short a compass are told *exactly* in the same order of time, he is not to be reason'd with.

The 4th. Proposition affirms, ' That St. Matthew, and St. Mark, and St. Luke do use the *Jewish* Accounts in their Gospels, and so reckon the Hours from Sun-setting, and Sun-rising, the beginnings of the *Jewish* Night and Day. And for this the Author bids us see, *Lev. 23. 32.* From Even unto Even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath. Which Injunction there seems yet only affix'd to that solemn Day of Expiation; tho' the *Jews* practise'd accordingly in all their Sabbaths. But what is this to the natural Day? This beginning and ending of their Day and Night is universally allow'd, saith he, by all Expositors. Now I confess I have not seen all Expositors as I perceive he has, but *Vatablus* that lies before me writes. *Prima Hebraeorum hora est sexta nostra antemeridiana*, that the first Hour of the *Jews* began with the *Roman* six in the Morning. And what this Author says demonstrates his Assertion beyond contradiction is a *clear Confutation* of it. That the darkness at our Saviour's Passion from Noon till 3 a Clock is call'd the space from the sixth to the ninth Hour by the 3 Evangelists; for then they must begin from

from 6 to 6. For our Saviour says, *John 11. 9* Are there not 12 hours in the day? Neither can this be evaded by supposing that they lengthned and shortned their Hours according to the Times of Summer and Winter (which yet no ways appears) for he adds in the next Page, 'That the Roman sixth or 6 a Clock in the Morning was about 3 Hours before the Jewish 3d. Hour, or 9 a Clock with the Romans. And then the Hours of the Accounts of both sides must be fix'd and lasting.

The 5th. Proposition adds, 'That St. John writing his Gospel after the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and at *Ephesus* a place far remote from *Judea*, and under the Roman Government, uses the Roman, or Julian beginning of the day in his Gospel. Here I would ask this Man, How then the other Evangelists wherever they were, speaking of things done among the Jews, came to write all of them in the Jewish Dialect? Not only St. Matthew who was then at *Jerusalem*, according to St. Jerom and Epiphanius; but St. Mark who was then at Rome with St. Peter, as all the Ancients affirm, particularly Papias, Irenaeus, St. Clement cited by St. Jerome, Tertullian, Eusebius, St. Jerome, &c. Only Irenaeus says, His Gospel was written there after St. Peter's death, and St. Luke who wrote his Gospel travelling with St. Paul in *Achaia*, and *Beotia*, as St. Jerom observes. And yet St. John alone must write their Affairs in such Days and Hours as were not used among them? Neither will it help the Matter to say, That he wrote after the Jewish Policy was destroy'd: For his Writings relate their Transaction and Government before they were destroy'd. And for his Axiom 'That every Writer is to be supposed to use the Stile, Year, and Computation of the Age and Nation in which he lives; it will as well affect St. Mark, and St. Luke, as St. John; which yet we see it did not. Nor lastly, is it certain that the Roman or Julian Day was used in any part of *Asia* where St. John was; or if it was at *Ephesus*, because under the Romans (as this Man suggests) we may as well expect to find it in *Palestine* which was equally under the Roman Government. And tho' it was remote from *Ephesus*, yet a small skill in Geography, might have told him that however *Achaia* and *Beotia* where St. Luke wrote was near enough. But saith our Author, there is one certain and undeniable Instance of it in St. John himself, as an Indication of his reckoning, so in other cases. For when our Saviour about 9 or 10 a Clock at Night on the Day of his Resurrection, or about the 3d. or 4th.

Hour

1. In Euseb.
2. 2. c. 15.
3. c. 1.
4. contr. Marcion.

Hour of the *Jews* second Day of the Week appeared to his Disciples, he expressly calls it still the first day of the Week. *John* 20. 19. The same Day at Evening, being the first Day of the Week. Now look here, St. *John* does not say *one word* what Hour, much less that it was about 9 or 10 at Night, but only that it was at *Evening*. Besides, how comes 9 or 10 a Clock at Night on a Lord's Day in the *Roman* Account to be about the 3d. or 4th. Hour of the *Jews* second Day of the Week? When he had but just told us, That the *Jews* begin their Day at Sun-rising, and not at Sun-setting. *Risum teneatis Amici?* But in the very first Chapter of this Gospel two of the Baptists Disciples abode with Christ a considerable part of a Day after the 10th. Hour, or 10 a Clock; and after the same time *Andrew* seeks and finds his Brother *Simon* and brings him to our Saviour. This is a *certain proof* against him that it could not be the *Roman* Day, which would be too late after 10 a Clock for so long tarrying and business, if he means 10 at Night; but otherwise the *Jewish* 10th. Hour was about 4 a Clock in the afternoon, and sufficient for what is mention'd to be done after; and then the Original well expresses it, *ἡμέρα δὲ ἦν ὡς δυνάμην*, but it was about the 10th. Hour, *vers.* 39. implying that the Day was far spent. And therefore the Margin rightly notes, It was 2 Hours before Night. For the *Jews* divided their Day into 12 Hours according to our Saviours answer, *John* 11. 9. As well as by their Hours of Prayer, which were their 3d. 6th. and 9th. All before the 3d. and after the 9th. when they began and ended, were always named as first, second, 10th. 11th. but never 4th. 5th. 7th. 8th. And this explains that perplexing difficulty, which this Author says, is *insuperable*. It was about the sixth Hour, saith St. *John* just before his Condemnation (as this Author allows) and being deliver'd to be crucified (which was not then 3 Hours afterwards sure as he affirms) but the 3d. Hour saith St. *Mark* 15. *Mark*, and they Crucified him. All the time betwixt 9 and 12, being call'd the 3d. Hour, as between 12 and 3, was called the 6th. And therefore the latter end of the 3d. Hour was about the beginning of the 6th. when there was darkness over all the Earth until the 9th. Hour. About this 6th. Hour our Saviour met with the Woman of *Samaria*, *John* 4. 6. And probably about 4 Months before Harvest, according to *verse* 35. Say ye not, there are yet 4 Months and then cometh Harvest. Which (yet) seems

to imply that they are no Proverbial Expression useable at any time, as our Author supposes.

The sixth Proposition informs us, That the resemblance between several Discourses and Miracles of our Saviour in the several Gospels, is no sufficient Reason for supposing them to be the very same. And upon that adds, That the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon our Saviour as a Token of his being the true Messias, to John the Baptist was wholly different from, and happen'd before the descent of the Holy Ghost at our Saviour's Baptism: I believe this will prove one of our Author's *Esophisms*, or new found Notions, not one jot wiser than the rest. I saw, p John 1. 32. says John the Baptist, the Spirit descending from Heaven like a Dove, and it abode upon him. True, saith he, and for this Reason the Descent at Christ's Baptism was not St. John's Signal: For our Saviour going immediately into the Wilderness, afforded no time for the Mansion, or permanent continuance of the Signal, which was but necessary in this case. As if the Dove to become a Signal, must have dwelt upon our Saviour's Head, and been carried every where about with him. It is sufficient that this Resemblance did not suddenly disappear, but continued some while for a Signal to St. John, and all the People; or rather, that the Holy Ghost resting upon the Head of our Saviour in the shape of a Dove for ever abode with him. But saith our Author, there is no evidence that the Baptist either saw or heard any thing of that Appearance or Voice at Christ's Baptism. This is very strange, when himself says, I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a Dove; and as strange that he should not also hear the Voice from Heaven, which in his Presence proclaim'd our Saviour to be the Messias, or the beloved Son of God, with a special charge upon all the People to hear him. But saith the Baptist, I knew him not, but he that sent me to Baptize with Water, the same laid unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he that Baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. Which Divine Characteristick of the Messias. St. John had seen before the Baptism; for as Jesus was coming to be Baptized, the Baptist knew him. That is, the same who gave this External Characteristick of the Messias, reveal'd to St. John at the same time, that this was that Holy Person upon whom it should fall, adding an outward to an inward Testimony. But saith this Author, St. John in his Gospel

Gospel never relates one single History which he found recorded by the other Evangelists before the Passion, except the feeding 5000 in the Wilderness. Now here is a plain instance to the contrary. Besides who would heed what this Man says, for in the very Chapter where this Miracle of feeding 5000 is recorded, in the very next Verse after, St. John relates, chap. 6. 15. Jesus his withdrawing himself from his Disciples, and the same Evening in a tempestuous Season walking upon the Waves to 'em: Which St. Matthew and St. Mark (especially the former) had more at large described before. And he will also soon enough see that the Anointing of our Saviour by a Woman in St. John was the same with his Anointing in St. Matthew and St. Mark. Lastly, That the first 4 Chapters in St. John in which this History is related, was long before the Baptism of our Saviour is easier said than proved; nay, will quickly appear another Mistake.

In the next Corollary about the Election of the Apostles, our Author premises a formal Story of his own, about our Saviour's Voyages in those times and his several Attendants as particularly as if he had been there; and is most like to what I have heard some Country Fellows tell me of the Duke of Monmouth's Travels beyond Sea. And after this premised by him, I do not see the Call of the Apostles mention'd by St. Matthew and St. Mark, to be different from or before the Call mention'd by St. Luke, as he affirms. The former say, That Jesus was walking by the Sea of Galilee, St. Luke, that as he stood by the Lake of Gennesareth (near the same place, as our Author acknowledgeth) the croud pressed upon him to hear the word of God; the former that Simon and Andrew were casting a Net into the Sea, but James and John were in their Ship with their Father mending their Nets; the latter, that both their Ships were by the Lake, but the Fishermen were gone out of them, and washing their Nets, and Jesus went into Simon's Ship, and taught the People out of it, after which he procured them a mighty draught of Fishes; the former, that Jesus said to 'em follow me and I will make you Fishers of Men, and they straightway two of them left their Nets and the other two the Ship, and their Father and hired Servants and follow'd him: The latter, that from henceforth they should catch Men, and they forsook all and follow'd him. I see no other difference, but that St. Luke enlarged in more particulars upon what the other Evangelists had pass'd over briefly.

* Hierof.
Berac. fol.
13. 3. &
Bab. Joma.
fol. 66. 1.

r 1 Cor. 14.
16. Pf. 41.
& 72. &
39. & 106.

That the Lord's Prayer was twice given to the Disciples, is sufficiently evident, tho' not the reason of it. The Doxology added to one being so like that publick Response of the People in the Temple Service, * Blessed be the Name of the Glory of his Kingdom for ever and ever, not only shews that our Saviour design'd this Prayer for publick use, but this part for the Peoples Answer. And tho' Amen was not at all used in the publick Prayers in the Temple; yet in the Synagogues where the *Jews* commonly ended all their Prayers with Thanksgiving and Benediction, Blessed be thou, O Lord, &c. It was answered by all Amen, being used only * at giving of Thanks. Both which favouring of publick use, were omitted by Christ when his Disciples afterwards seem'd to desire a privater Form (which not only St. *John* but the Doctors among the *Jews* usually taught their Disciples) for even Amen, seldom if ever, * any praying privately added to the end of his Prayers, saith Dr. *Lightfoot*. And Christ also delivering a Form of Prayer merely Petitionary as *John's* Disciples, *ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἴδωμεν*, leaves it out, *Luk. 11. 2.*

I come now to enquire why the anointing of our Saviour by a Woman in S. *John* should be so wholly different from that in S. *Matthew* and S. *Mark*, as this Author pretends? * It must be confess'd saith he, that the Time and Place agreeing so nearly, both anointings being a few Days before the Passover and in *Bethany*; that the Price of the Ointment being the very same, 300 Pence; and that at both times the Woman being reproved by others and vindicated by our Saviour; these are Circumstances so like, that there is a great deal of Colour for supposing them to be the very same Histories. Where then is the difference? 1. S. *John* says, * Then Jesus six days before the Passover came to *Bethany*—There they made him a Supper: But S. *Matthew* and S. *Mark* say, two Days before the Passover, being in *Bethany* as he sat at Meat, that is, he came down to *Bethany* six Days before the Passover, but the Feast was not made him till 4 Days after his coming. 2. S. *John's* History was in the House of *Martha*, the Sister of *Lazarus*; but the other in the House of *Simon* the Leper. Here he is mistaken, *Jesus* came to *Bethany* where *Lazarus* was, There i. e. in *Bethany* they made him a Supper, but it does not say, it was in the House of *Martha*, but only that she served. Whereas the other Evangelists plainly tell us, it was in the House of *Simon* the Leper. 3. The anointing in

* in *S. John* was only of Civility and Respect, and so was only of the Feet according to the Custom of the Country: But the other was of the Head, and thence of the whole Body in the Nature of a Funeral Preparation. Now this is a sign that he does not know the Custom of the Country, which in those times was and is at this very Day for their first Entertainment of their Noblemen and chief Friends and Persons of Quality, to pour perfumed Oils on their Heads till it run down 'em to the Skirts of their clothing, which is usually white Linen in those Eastern Parts; and this Ceremony is probably used because of their much Sweating. But as for any Funeral Preparation, which this Man says, is easy to observe in the several Histories; How could *Mary* design any such at that time to our Saviour, before she knew of any Trial, and to a Person living? Some of the Disciples grumbled at this Expenditure, but *Judas* is only mentioned in *St. John*, because he in all likelihood made most ado, and out of a base Design, being a Thief and had the Bag, *John* 12. 6. The Apology our Saviour makes, Against my burying hath she kept this; or, she is come aforehand to anoint my Body to the burying; or she did it for my Burial, is all of the same Sense, I have but a little while to live, and since you use to embalm the dead, this may serve for that and be instead of it.

That our Saviour cast the Traders out of the Temple twice in the Week before his Passion, is not at all certain or so much as probable, tho' *S. Matthew* and *S. Mark* (one of 'em not observing exactly the Order of Time) mention it at two different times of Christ's coming to *Jerusalem* that Week. For *S. Luke* describes it but once, and all three in the same manner done, and near with the same Expressions: For, My House shall be called an House of Prayer, or an House of Prayer to all Nations is of no valuable difference. And what *S. Mark* adds, that he would not suffer any one so much as to carry a Vessel thro' the Temple, is not contradictory to the rest. But how our Author proves this done twice then is very pleasant. 'For *S. Mark*, says he, hints to us the first Day somewhat that agrees very well with the driving of the Traders out of the Temple. For he assures us, that he look'd round about upon all things in the Temple before he went out of it that Evening. And he look'd very sourly indeed, if he thereby frighted the Buyers and Sellers out of it.

u 1 Sam. 9.
12, 13.

The 7th. and 8th. Propositions which speak of a more private Ministry of our Saviour before his Baptism, and his publick Ministry afterwards in *Galilee* upon *John's* Imprisonment, are groundless, very unlearned, and contrary to the express words of Scripture. For *Act. 1. 21.* Wherefore of these Men saith *S. Peter*, who have companied with us all the time that the Lord *Jesus* went in and out among us, beginning from the Baptism of *John* (i. e. from his being baptized of him, as not one of the Criticks but agree) unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his Resurrection; hereby shewing us, that from his Baptism to his Ascension was all the time that the Lord *Jesus* went in and out (or began to act as the *Messias*) among the People. And agreeably to this, he ought to know (by a small Diverſion) that when God had promised a Succession of Prophets among the *Jews* to resort to, that they might not Apostatize to Heathen Oracles, he ordinarily took them out of the Seminaries of the Levites or Schools of the Prophets scatter'd in *Israel*, who were to be resident when the People resorted to the "High Places to worship, to bless their Sacrifices and instruct them during the Captivity or uncertain abode of the Ark after the Desolation of *Shiloh*. These were, sometimes called out by the Inspiration of God; which being so common amongst them, needed no extraordinary Gifts to manifest the Divine Authority by which they were employ'd; their Education in the Schools of the Prophets removing all Prejudices from them, and there were Rules given to try their Doctrines and Predictions by. Not but that sometimes God furnished them with sufficient Testimony of this Commission from himself, and sometimes chose them elsewhere, as *Isaiah* from the Court and *Amos* from his Flock, but ordinarily from these Schools of the Prophets which seem to be instituted at the time aforesaid. Now in them the Youth were trained up by Study and Discipline till they were 30 Years old, before they entred upon their Prophe-tical Office; at 50 they were superannuated and only train'd up the Scholars in the Study of the Law according to *Numb. 4. 47.* From 30 Years old and upwards even unto 50 Years old was every ones Age to be that came to do the Service of the Ministry. And by the Law of the Nation and Custom of the Religion no Priest was to officiate, or Prophet preach before. Hence it was that *John the Baptist*, and about six Months after, *Jesus* when he

he was about 30 Years of Age as *S. Luke* says, according to *Luk 3.* the Law and Custom of his Country entred upon their Prophe-^{23.} tical Office. And the ancient Christians did think our Saviour so exact in it, That the Constitutions of *S. James* and the Apostles appointed the Festival of Christ's Birth to be kept on *Jan. 6.* upon which Day his Baptism was anciently celebrated, (even in the very Office of our own Church for that Day before the Restauration, where the first Lesson was of the Mission of the Baptist, *Isa. 40.* and the second Lesson ended with the Baptism of Christ, *Luk. 3. 23.*) because he was 30 Years old at his Baptism, when he entred upon his Office as the *Messias*, and therefore it was thought to be also his Birth Day, and Epiphany to mean the Glorious appearing of God in humane Nature, when he was attended with an unusual Star, and a numerous Company of the Heavenly Host. And the Apostle might give occasion to the Expression, *Tir. 2. 11.* where he says, The Grace of God *inopon* hath appeared. And we find that in the time of *John Cassian* they kept not only the Festival of Christ's Baptism, but his Nativity in *Egypt* on the Feast of Epiphany in the 5th Century. Accordingly in the Christian Church *Justinian Novel 123* decrees, That those who are to be ordained Priests, shall be 30 Years old, and the Council of *Agatha, an. 506. Can. 17.* forbids any to ordain a Priest under that Age. So the Council of *Arles, an. 524. Can. 1.* And the 3d Council of *Orleans, an. 538. Can. 6.* and 4th Council of *Toledo, an. 633. Can. 20.* and the Council of *Constantinople* call'd *Quini-Sext. Can. 14.* and *Charlemaign's Capitulary of Brancford, an. 794. Cap. 47.*

But what says our Author? He brings a long Quotation out of *Eusebius* in Greek and the English to it (*nothing to the purpose,* and he confesserth, it is but little regarded) 'That *S. John* in his Gospel gives an account of those Acts of our Saviour which were before the Imprisonment of the Baptist and had been omitted by the former Evangelists This we all know, and he need not to have told it us twice: And yet our Saviour preach'd publickly before the Imprisonment of *John the Baptist*. For *Joh. 4. 1.* *he baptized in Judea more Disciples than John,* before that time when our Author supposes he began his publick Ministry in *Galilee*: Inſomuch that *Joh. 3. 26. John's Disciples came and ſaid to him, Rabbi, be that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bareſt witneſs, behold, the ſame baptizeth, and all men come*

to him: Plainly enough shewing that this was also after his Baptism at the River *Jordan*, and *John's* Testimony of him there. And whereas this Author says, Christ's publick Preaching is immediately to succeed the 5th Chapter of *S. John*; these Instances are before that time. And in the second Chapter we read of *Jesus's* going up to *Jerusalem* at the Passover when he drove the Buyers and Sellers out of the Temple, and *on the very Feast day many believed in his Name when they saw the Miracles which he did*, v. 23. which was certainly as publick an Exercise of his Ministry as he could shew after in *Galilee*. In the beginning of the 3d. Chapter *Nicodemus* a Ruler of the *Jews*, owns him to be a Teacher come from God, and that no man could do those Miracles else; towards the latter end of it *John Baptist* says, that God had given all things into his hand, and testifies that he who did not believe in this Son of God, should not see Life; and in the 4th Chapter, the *Galileans* received him, having seen all the things that he did at *Jerusalem* at the Feast. Nothing here favours of a private Ministry. After this there was a Feast of the *Jews*, and *Jesus* went up to *Jerusalem*, Joh. 5. 1. and cured a diseased Man by the Sheep-Market on the Sabbath Day, which so incensed the *Jews* against him, that they sought to kill him, because he not only had broke the Sabbath, but said God was his Father, making himself equal with God, or declaring himself thereby to be the *Messias*; which he defendeth in a long Sermon by divers Testimonies. What more publick Ministry would this Man have? But saith this Author, baptizing was one part of our Saviour's Ministry; but when he desired to be baptized of *John*, his answer was, I have need to be baptized of thee; fairly implying that Christ was known to have baptized before. Is this a Mathematician's Consequence who is so full of his Demonstrations, that because our Saviour was fitter to take Disciples than to be one, he had already began to do so? I should from hence rather conclude, that this Man never took Pupils, because this shews him not very fit for it. The next Argument is worse, That Christ's Baptism did not precede his whole Ministry, because it is said, *Luk. 3. 21.* when all the People were baptized, *Jesus* was baptized, as if this was at the Conclusion of *John's* Ministry who would now baptize no more: When the words evidently mean only the Crowd of People at that time who came to *John's* Baptism. Neither are we about to alter the 15th Year of *Tiberius*

berius, when the Preaching and Baptism of *John* began, since our Saviour's began about six Months after. But our Author makes *strange work* of this, and tells us, That the Preaching of *John* Baptist did immediately precede that of Christ, who yet was (as he can prove) 31 Years Old, about Nine Weeks after the beginning of the 15th of *Tiberius*. And as for the notation of time which *St. Luke* mentions, that our Saviour was about 30 Years of Age at his Baptism, it cannot well be extended saith he, any farther than from 29 to 31. But it may be taken any where within that Latitude, without the least strain or force upon the Words. How can he say this? when his sixth Hypothesis or Observation is, 'Even numbers of Years in the Chronology of Scripture' are used with great exactness and comprehend no more than six Months on either side, *i. e.* they imply the space mentioned to be nearer to that number than to the next, either over or under, according to the most natural and strict signification of the words themselves. Thus 40 Years in the Sacred stile of Chronology, denote only the space between 39½ on the one side, and 40½ on the other. And the Addition of the Particle [About] rather fixes the number nearer to that mentioned than to any other; especially where it is added, He began to be about 30 Years of Age: which plainly implies that 30 was all he was, or thereabouts. Besides, he does not consider that this *overthrows* his whole Hypothesis he is so concerned for, at *one stroke*; which he and all his Friends for him, cannot evade. For if Christ was 31 Years Old, about Nine Weeks after the beginning of the 15th of *Tiberius*, soon after the time when *S. Luke* says he was baptized; and *S. John* Baptist began his Preaching in the Wilderness about a Fortnight before Christ (as he affirms) in the same Year of *Tiberius*: Here are above two Years (as he reckons) of the Baptist's Preaching, and all our Saviour's private Ministry before his Baptism carried away in one *unthoughtful Sentence*. Lastly, When *S. Luke* writes immediately after Christ's Baptism, that he began to be about 30 Years of Age, if he was then 31 within a little more than a Month; for so far only is the Feast of Tabernacles (where he fixes this Date) before the 25th of *October*; (when he supposes Christ was born) it should rather have been express'd, He began to be about 31. And for what he adds at the beginning of the next Proposition relating to this matter, That from the commencing of Christ's Ministry to his Death

was four Years and a half, I thought the Prophet *Daniel* had determin'd it to be but three and a half in those words about *Messiah the Prince*, *Dan. 9. 27.* *In the midst of the Week* (a Day passing for a Year in that Prophetical Language) *he shall cause the Sacrifice and the oblation to cease.* I am sure the Learned *Jews* understood it so. *Rabbi Hadarson* proves from this place, that after *Messias* shall have preached half Seven Years he shall be Slain; for that *Daniel* saith, In half of Seven Years the Host and Sacrifice shall cease: upon which he and others Comment thus, Three Years and a half shall the presence of God in Flesh Cry and Preach upon the Mount *Olivet*, and then shall be Slain. Which words the *Jews* ordinary Commentary upon the *Psalms* interprets to be meant of *Christ's* preaching Three Years and a half before his Passion.

The 9th Proposition reckons the Passovers during our Saviour's Ministry to be five. But the worst is, he can find the second nowhere but in *Job. 5. 1.* *After these things there was a Feast of the Jews and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.* Now he knows that the word Feast does no more denote the Passover than any other of the *Jewish* Festivals; nor has it here any prepositive Article whence we might conclude it to be called The Feast by way of Eminence and so mean the Principal; nor does the word anywhere else in the New Testament signifie of it self the Feast of the Passover, but where the Passover is expressly mentioned before. Nor is it at all probable by the Context, For *Job. 2. 23.* *Jesus was in Jerusalem at the Passover in the Feast day;* c. 3. 22. leaves the City and comes εἰς τὴν γῆν into the Land or Country of *Judea*, there he tarried with them and baptized; but c. 4. 3. he left *Judea* because of the *Pharisees*, and went through *Samaria*, where he staid but two Days, v. 43. into *Galilee*, where the *Galileans* receive him, having seen all the things that he did at *Jerusalem* at the Feast; which implies that this was no long time after. But c. 5. 1. After the very second Miracle done in *Galilee*, it is said there was a Feast of the *Jews*, and *Jesus* went up to *Jerusalem*, as if it was but some of their more ordinary or less principal Feasts. Now this could not well be so soon as the Feast of Weeks or Pentecosts, which was but Seven Weeks from the second Day of the Passover Solemnity. But because the 7th Month that of *Tisri* was the most famous of all the Months in the Year for the *Jewish* Feasts and Solemnities, as well as the first Month in their civil

civil Accounts; On the first Day was their Feast of Trumpets, on the 10th was their great Day of Expiation, and the Feast of Tabernacles from the 15th to the Twenty second. This Feast which our Author supposes was the Passover, might very well be the Feast of Trumpets, (near six Months after Jesus came last from *Jerusalem*) or the Feast of Tabernacles. As for the *Pharisees* whom our Saviour shunn'd, he left them in the Country of *Judea*: For surely there were more *Pharisees* than at *Jerusalem*, they being a Sect of People dispersed over the Nation. But at *Jerusalem* Christ had met with a very kind reception where many believed in his Name, and *Nicodemus* one of their Rulers came to wait upon him. Lastly, After this Feast, the next Chapter v. 4. says the Passover was nigh, which demonstrates that this Feast was not the Passover, not only from the difference of the expression; but there is such a visible Historical coherence in the narration as shews the Passover in c. 6. was the next Feast to this we are about. Much less was there any third Passover betwixt these two Festivals in this short space of *S. John's* History, but omitted by him, because mentioned by the other Evangelists, whose defects he did only supply: since this very 6th Chapter in more Instances than one is a proof to the contrary.

The Parable of the barren Fig-tree (which he adds) being three Years manured without any Fruit from it, and after the 4th if it bare not, to be cut down, does not prove that Christ preached four Years and a half to the *Jews* any more than the immediate Destruction of their Nation afterwards. For in the Parable there is but only one more Year desired.

The 10th Proposition does chiefly correct our *English* Translation of *Joh. 2. 20.* *Forty and six Years was this Temple in building, And wilt thou rear it up in three Days?* and says it should be, Forty and six Years has this Temple been built *ἡκοδόμηθη ὁ ναὸς ἑτῷ*: tho' he adds, 'The *Jews* 'tis true do not reason so exactly by this rendring of the Words as by the other. But he should have given us all the Original Words, and then we should not need his new Translation, *τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἑξήκοντα ἡκοδόμηθη ὁ ναὸς ἑτῷ*, *quadraginta & sex annis*, In six and forty Years was this Temple built, i. e. it has took so many Years in building it, And wilt thou rear it up in three Days? *Josephus* tells us, That *Herod* began ^{*Antiq. l. 15. c. 14.*} this Work in the 18th Year of his Reign, nor is there any ^{*De Bell. l. 1. c. 16.*} mistake (as this Authour says) when he elsewhere ² tells us, It ¹ was

was in the 15th, because the 15th Year of his Reign alone after he had conquered *Antigonus*, was the 18th Year, from the time that the *Romans* had declared him King. And tho' *Josephus* says, The main Structure was finish'd in about Eight Years time; yet it is plain from him, that they were always adding more building to it, till he at last writes, that under *Agrippa Junior*, 60 Years after Christ's Birth, Ἡ δὲ τότε καὶ τὸ ἱερόν τετέλεστο, *Et jam tum perfectum est Templum*, That the Temple was then at length finish'd.

The 11th Proposition gives a most unreasonable and absurd Interpretation of the word Taxing, *Luke 2. 2.* different from the Sense of the Word in the Verse before and after in the same Story. There went out a Decree from *Cæsar Augustus*, ἀπογράφειν πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, that all the World, i. e. the Roman Empire should be written or enrolled, *Ut notum esset*, saith *Grotius*, *quid Regna quæque & Provinciæ hominum copiâ, quid pecuniis valerent. Nam ea vis census, Floro docente, ut omnia patrimonii, dignitatis, ætatis, artium, officiorumq; discrimina in tabulas referantur*, that the Number, Age and Quality of the People might be known. Whence *Cicero de legibus 3.* *Censores populi æuitates, soboles, familias, pecuniaq; censento.* And *Claudius*, *Nil ultra exquisitum Censu a se actò per Galliam Augusti jussu quàm ut publicè notæ essent facultates.* This taxing or enrolment saith *S. Luke* (referring to that he had just mention'd) was first made when *Cyrenius* was Governor of *Syria* (i. e. saith this Author, about 10 Years after, when a Tax or Levy of Money was gathered) and all went to be taxed, every one into his own City. 'Tis the very same taxing (let the word mean what it will) in all the three Verses: And why should this Author make the middle Verse of a quite different Sense from the two others? Here is no more taxing of Money meant in the second Verse than there is in the first and third. All the difficulty is (which he does not mention) how *Cyrenius* can be said to be Governour of *Syria*, when it was *Sentius Saturninus* at that time. To which I answer, That when *Augustus* divided the Provinces of the Empire, he sent together with the President of each Province as the Governour in chief, a Procurator under him to take care of the Imperial Revenues, and keep the publick Accompts: And such was *Cyrenius* in the same Post with *Volumnius*, whom *Josephus* calls a *Cæsar's* Procurator under the same *Saturninus*, and both of them ^b *ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ* Governour of *Syria*, by the same word which *S. Luke* useth.

^a Bell. Jud.

1. 17.

^b Antiq.

16. 17.

The next thing observable relates to our Saviour's Birth in the 14th Proposition. Where in the first place I do not see but that the 12th Day might very well be that on which the Wise Men came to *Bethlehem*, since *Mat. 2. 1.* it is said, *When Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, there came Wise Men from the East-- v. 8. And Herod sent them to Bethlehem-- v. 11. And they saw the young Child with Mary his Mother.* All this seems plainly to be soon after Christ's Birth when they were at *Bethlehem* to be enrolled, and there fulfilled the Prophecie. But we cannot suppose they staid any long time there, at an Inn from their own home, especially having but indifferent reception; nay, when the Purification was over, they returned to *Nazareth*, *Luke 2. 39.* nor do we read of any return they made thither for any other businels, and consequently we must believe (with this Author, tho' not for his Reasons) that the Slaughter of the Infants immediately followed the departure of the Wise Men, and the Death of *Herod* soon after that, *Joseph's* return upon it from *Egypt* into the Land of *Israel*, being hastned away by an Angel, and all before the 40 Days of *Mary's* Purification, according to the Law of *Moses* were accomplished. For as soon as the Wise Men were departed from *Bethlehem*, ἀναχωροῦντες αὐτῶν, *Joseph* took the young Child and his Mother by Night, and departed into *Egypt*, *Mat. 2. 14.* whom yet we find at the Temple at the Purification, according to the Law of *Moses*, *Luke 2. 22.* And I see as little cause to alter the Date of *Christmas* Day from the 25th of *December*, on which the Antient Tradition of the Church has fixed it. For tho' before *S. Chrysostome's* time *Christmas* Day was not absolutely settled, but variously observed in the *Eastern* Church: Yet the Censual Tables of *Augustus* were to be seen some Hundreds of Years after Christ's Death, which contained the very Place and Day of the Month, and Year of every Person's enrolment, together with their Age (as we have seen) and other qualities, and amongst others Recorded that *Joseph* and *Mary* were enrolled on the Eighth Calend of *January*, with their Son *Jesus* the Day following his Birth. And to these Censual Rolls doth *S. Chrysostome* appeal, for the Day of Christ's Birth, which he professes to have received, τὰ παλαιὰ ἐκείνων, *Hom. in Nat. ad pop. Antioch.* from those that accurately knew these things, and which dwell in the City of *Rome*, and had observed this Day, ἀναδεν καὶ ἐκ παλαιὰς παραδόσεως, by an antient Tradition from their Ancestors.

To

^d *Apol.* 2. To these Tables does ^d *Justin Martyr* refer the Emperors of Rome for the evidencing the place of Christ's Birth, *ὡς ἔξ μαθεῖν ὁρᾶται ἐν τῶν Ἀπογεγραμμένων*, as you may learn out of the Rolls. And so

^e *Contr.* *Tertullian*, ^e *Censum Augusti fidelissimum testem Dominicae Nativitatis Romana Archiva custodiunt*, The Roman Archives preserve *Augustus* Censual Roll a most faithful witness of the Birth of Christ.

^f *Hist.* 1. 2. ^{c.} 2. Now *Tertullian* lived in Rome, was a learned Man, *τὸς ῥωμαῖος νόμος ἡκεῖθεν* was well skilled in the Roman Laws saith ^f *Eusebius*, divers Years before he was a Christian (which was about 180 Years after Christ's Ascension) *ἀνὴρ τε ἄλλα ἐνδοξὸς καὶ τῶν μάλιστα ἐπὶ ῥωμαῖς λαμπρῶν*, and a Person of Quality who had great ability by reason of the Honour of his Family, learning and place wherein he lived to see and know the Records of the Romans.

^g *Of the Festivals of the Church.* And ^g *Dr. Hammond* adds, That in *Joseph the Egyptian's* Arabick Codex of the Councils (a MS. in the Archives of the Publick Library at Oxford) this Day is affirm'd to stand-by an Apostolical Canon; the words of which are, That you constitute an Anniversary Feast at the Nativity of the Lord Christ, on the Day on which he was Born, and that was the 25th of the first Canun, *i. e.* of December. Also that ye do every Year Celebrate the Baptism of the Lord Christ, upon the Day in which he was Baptized by *John* his forerunner, and that was the 6th Day of the second Canun, *i. e.* of January. So *Sabid Aben Batrick* (a MS. Arabick Historian in the Archives of the Publick Library at Cambridge) affirmeth, That our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ was Born upon the 25th of the first Canun, *i. e.* of December, and upon the 11th Day of *Tybi*, *i. e.* the sixth of the second Canun, *i. e.* January was the Epiphany or Baptism of Christ. So the *Egyptian* Calendar in *Kircker de Comput. Eccles. Copt. c. 3.* And so *Johannes Antiochenus* or *Melala*, That Christ was Born upon the 25th of December, but Baptized in *Jordan*, a River of *Palestine*, on the 6th of the Month *Audine* or *January*. So the antient Author of the Constitutions, Let the Nativity be celebrated on the 25th of the 9th Month, beginning the Year in *March*, when he was conceived, *l. 5. c. 13.* And in the 93d Question, under the name of *Athanasius Nicenus*, 'tis cited out of the *Ἀποστολικὰ διδάγματα*, our Lord was Born the 25th of the *Egyptian* Month *Chaac*, Eight Days before the Calends of *January*. *Dr. Hammond* (from whom I have these Testimonies) further informs us, that in our old Monuments this Feast of the Nativity was called
Midwinter-

Midwinter-Day, as from those times we call *June 24*, *Midsummer Day* half a Year before it. Now by reason of the Proceſſion of the *Æquinoxes* and *Solſtices*, the *Solſticial* or *Midwinter Day*, when the Sun enters *Capricorn* is conſiderably diſtant from our *Chriſtmaſs Day*, and proportionably is the Summer Solſtice removed from *Midsummer Day*, as we ſtill call it: By Calculation it will appear that the 25th of *December*, near our Saviour's time fell upon the Winter Solſtice, when it was capable of that Appellation. After theſe things what heed is to be given to this Author who ſays, ' He does not Acquieſce in that as the true Day of ' Chriſt's Birth, but does place it two Months ſooner; that the ' antient Church had no Authentick Accounts of the time of the ' Birth of Chriſt, of his Baptiſm, the number of his publick ' Paſſovers, or time of his Death, but were generally miſtaken in ' every one of thoſe particulars; that they might eaſily miſtake ' this, by confounding the Nominal 10th Month, or *December* ' with the real 10th Month, or *October*. As if they were all a company of Fools, and he only has found 'em out to be ſo; and can tell matters of fact done in thoſe times better than they, and all their Records. Much like his at laſt reaſonably concluding (as he calls it *Pag. 161.*) about this very matter, That *October 25th* is two Months and ſeven Days before *December 25*. Which was to be demonſtrated; when no body elſe can find above two Months and five Days. His Argument drawn from the courſes of the Priests, makes it probable that he has ſomewhere met with the Book on that Subject and Deſign, which Dr. *Hammond* ſays is evidently demonſtrated by a very ' Worthy and Ingenuous Perſon to be a mere deceit. ' But ſays ' he, this time of the Year was unfit for travelling to the enrolment. Surely this Man has lived much in ſome very dirty Country; tho' he might have learned from *Joſephus* that the ground in thoſe parts was generally Rocky. Beſides, they had Aſſes and Mules to ride on; and they muſt needs go, when there was an Order from the Emperor. ' But the Shepherds kept watch over ' their Flocks by Night; And who could blame them, rather than to have had them deſtroyed by wild Beaſts, of which that Country was full? And was there nothing to preſerve them againſt Cold? ' But it was unfit for the lying in of the Bleſſed Virgin in ' a Stable: She muſt needs Lie in there, when there was no room for 'em in the Inn, Or, would he have had her ſtaid till it was warmer Weather? Or, could not God take care of her there, as well as of many poor Wretches near the Pole? After all, it might

o Mr. J. T.'s
Chriſt's
Birth not
miſtimed.

might not be so very cold at that time in those hot Countries; since in the very Kingdom of *France*, there are generally but about two Months of Winter, and that sometimes uncertain.

But some very great Man he says, has told him, That the Christian Holy-days in commemoration of our Saviour and his Apostles, and those relating to him, seem to have been first fix'd by the Christian Church, not on the Days of their Births or Deaths, of which they were Ignorant; but of the Sun's entrance into Signs; especially the Equinox and Solstice Days as were noted among the Heathens for Days of Riot and Idolatry; and the 24th. or 25th Days of each Month, when we have generally a Holy Day but they Heathenish Solemnities. And for this reason did the Primitive Church observe the Annual Memorial of Christ's Birth, at the time of the Heathen *Saturnalia*, to wear out those pernicious practices, by the Holy Exercises of the Christian Festivals. I am not willing to dispute what any very great Man says, but this is directly to contradict the Opinion of the antient Fathers about the Nativity, which I have now produced chiefly from as Learned and Famous a Writer, and as truly Great as most our Nation has afforded, and more Testimonies are referr'd to in his Practical Catechism, who have all determin'd the particular Day of Christ's Birth, to be on the 25th of *December*, as well as his Baptism on the 6th of *January* following; and all Writers both *Pagan* and *Jewish* are said to agree to it; whereas not an antient Author is produced to prove that the *Pagan* Riots were the occasion of any one Christian Festival, *Christmas* and *Easter* was variously observed at first, and for the latter Apostolical Tradition was pretended on both sides, but no reference to Heathen Riots. Those relating to the Annuntiation, Birth of *John* Baptist, *Christmas* Day, Circumcision, Epiphany, Purification, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost, well Illustrate each other, without any reference to what the *Pagans* did. The *Saturnalia* were indeed celebrated by them in *December*, but they often continued the whole Month; to prevent or wear out which, a Christian Solemnity at the latter end of it was not well suited. The Anniversaries of the Martyrs were from the beginning of the Church Religiously kept, the Days of their Sufferings were called their *γενέθλια*, or Birth-Days, and most antient Churches were built upon the places of their Interment.

^h De Cor.

Mil. c. 3.

^b *Tertullian* says, That the Christians did Yearly Celebrate the Days

of

of the Martyrs Birth, *ex majorum traditione*, from the Tradition of their Ancestors. And the Church of *Smyrna* conclude their Letter with their hope, that God will now permit them to Celebrate the Birth-Day of their Bishop *Polycarp's* Martyrdom; fairly implying that the Days of the Apostles Martyrdom had not been neglected by the Church. Neither does the afflicted condition of the Primitive Christians seem to incline them to keep Festivals of Opposition.

As for that exact, Antient and Venerable division of the World (as he calls it) which is stiled the Tradition of the House of *Elias*, with which he concludes this Proposition; 2000 Years emptiness, 2000 Years the Law, and 2000 Years the Days of the Messias, *i. e.* possibly before the happy *Milennium* as our Author thinks. The *Tobu* rather means Chaos, as it does in the beginning of *Genesis*, which he Translates emptiness: And then we should Translate it, 2000 Years before the Creation, But what must we do with the rest? In short, instead of being a Venerable Division, I think it is as much *nonsense* as can be expressed in so few words; and the Original and this *Venerable* Author's Explication may well go together.

The Three next Propositions concern the Genealogy our Saviour, in *S. Matthew* and *S. Luke*. ' The former he says, relates ' the Natural Pedigree of *Joseph* from *David* by his Son *Solomon*; ' The second, of our Saviour himself by the Blessed Virgin: and ' that both are different from the Days of *David*. For my part, I think they are both the same, and shall not recede from the old Opinion of *Julius Africanus* recorded in *Eusebius*; which he is; *Hist. l. 7.* said to receive in the second Century, a *Judeis Christi Consanguineis*, *c. 1.* from the *Jews* of our Saviour's own kindred. *Matthas* say they, Married *Estha* and died, leaving a Son *Jacob* by her; *Melchi* of the same Tribe Marries *Matthas's* Relict by whom he had a Son *Heli*; *Heli* dying without Children, his Brother *Jacob* marrieth his Widow, and begets *Joseph*, who by the Law was to be called the Son of *Heli*, whose Name was to be upheld according to *Gen. 38. 9.* and *Deut. 25. 5, 6, 7.* Whence *S. Matthew* says, *Jacob* begat *Joseph*; but *S. Luke* describing the Legal descent says, *Joseph* was the Son of *Heli*. This Opinion *S. Augustine*, and *S. Ambrose* followed and *Eusebius*, *Naxianzene* and *S. Jerome*; *Andrew* of *Crete* in the Eighth Century, and *John Damascene*. *Dr. Lightfoot* says, It should be read in *S. Luke*, *Jesus* was the Son of *Heli*, of *Mat-*

that, &c. of *Adam*, of *God*; as *Gen.* 36. 2. *Abolibamah* was the Daughter of *Anah*, the Daughter of *Zibeon*; now *Anah* was the Father, *v.* 24, 25. and adds that *Mary* is called by the ^k *Jews* the Daughter of *Heli*, *i. e.* his Daughter in Law: for such are called Daughters in the Holy Writings. So *Ruth*, 1. 8. *Naomi* said unto her two Daughters-in-Law, Turn again my Daughters, *v.* 11, 12, 13. and so it is in all other Languages. And since the *Jews* never reckon Genealogies by the Mother, *Joseph's* was sufficient in this case: for *Mary* (of whose Brethren we read not) was by the Law of *Moses*, *Numb.* 36. 6, 7, 8. to Marry whom she thought best; only unto one of the Family of the Tribe of her Father must she Marry, that the Children of *Israel* might enjoy every Man the Inheritance of his Fathers.

¹ *Fer.* 22. 30. In this Genealogy *Jechonias*, who died ¹ Childless (whence *Assir* may mean *Jechonias* in Bonds, *1 Chr.* 3. 17. or a Son that never lived to Reign, for it is said, No Man of his Seed shall sit upon the Throne of *David*, and Rule any more in *Judab*) yet this Man is said to beget *Salathiel*, *Mat.* 1. 12. because by the Law of Inheritance he was his next Heir and Successor: else *Neri* is expressly called Father to *Salathiel*, *Luke* 3. 27. and *Salathiel* being Eldest, and bearing the Name, is said to beget *Zorubbabel*, who ^m *Pag.* 169. was his Brother *Pedaiah's* Son, *1 Chr.* 3. 17, 19. (tho' this ^m Author says he was not) the next Legal Successor being many times in Scripture called the Son. So Kings who were created by God to their new Dignity are called his Sons. *1 Sam.* 13. 1. *Saul* was the Son of one Year in his Kingdom. *2 Sam.* 7. 14. I have chosen him to be my Son, *i. e.* the King of *Israel*: and in a parallel place, *Psal.* 89. 27. I will make him my First-born, higher than the Kings of the Earth. And to our Saviour, Thou art my Son, this Day (*i. e.* when he anointed him) *γεννησας* *ος* (a word which our Author says, if applied to any other than a natural Derivation or a bare Succession only, is false and ridiculous, I am sure it is rather so in him to say it) I have begotten thee, *Heb.* 1. 5. So kiss the Son, *i. e.* submit your selves by that token of humble Subjection to *David*, who had his Authority immediately from God. And what was more usual in the *Roman* Emperors than to adopt a Person to be their Son or Successor in the Empire? Neither in this Genealogy do a few instances of a Legal descent at all prejudice the natural; since by the Law of *Moses*, the next of Kin in the same Tribe was to continue the Family:

But

But our Author has found it out, ' That the great Question with which S. *Matthew* was concerned, was not of what Linage, but in what place the Messias was to be Born, and accordingly 'tis most reasonable to look upon that as the principal end of his Genealogy. But why must S. *Matthew* tell a long Story of so many Generations, to shew where the Messias was Born? ' Because when it appear'd that *Joseph* was of the Tribe of *Judab*, and Family of *David*, every one knew in the time of Christ's Ministry, that *Joseph* was obliged above 30 Years before to go to *Betlehem* to be enrolled. But how does this prove that Jesus was Born there, for all the Women were not brought to Bed when they went to be enrolled? ' His Age and the Delivery at that time shew it. But I say, How could the *Jews* gather this from *Joseph's* going thither? ' Probably the New-born Child was easily to be found in the publick Records of that Enrollment. But none might be left there; and this is such a remote and obscure consequence from the Genealogy, that if this was the design of it, it might have been wholly spared, since S. *Matthew* directly tells us without it, c. 2. 1. Jesus was Born in *Betlehem* of *Judea*, in the Days of *Herod* the King. And if there was any Copy left upon Record at *Betlehem* of that Enrollment, which was to be transmitted to the *Roman Archives*, here is a fair occasion for any that would, to enquire into it for the place of Christ's Birth, more than by a bare Genealogy which said nothing about it. Neither do I see any necessity at all of a Genealogy in the Gospels merely to inform the *Jews*, who by the fundamental Constitution of their Government, were to keep their Tribes and Families exactly distinct from each other by Genealogical Records; some of which the Evangelists are supposed by our Author to Transcribe; and he adds, (tho *wanting memory*) ' That the Genealogy of our Saviour himself was so evident among the *Jews*, that in the first times of the Gospel they never questioned the truth of his being of the Tribe of *Judab*, and House of *David*: otherwise they would have urged the contrary, as an invincible Argument against his pretensions to be their Messias.

But observe says he, The Division of this Genealogy into three great Periods. ' The first from *Abraham* to *David*, before the Regal Government; The second from *David* to the Captivity under the Regal Government; The third from the Captivity to Christ after the Regal Government. Here I doubt our Author

has forgot that *Saul* Reign'd 40 Years before *David*; and *Herod* Reign'd before *Christ* near 34 Years, from the Slaughter of *Antigonus*, and near 37 from his first obtaining the Kingdom at *Rome*. And long before this, we find that *Aristobulus*, one of the *Maccabees* would be Crown'd King of *Judab*, and that his Posterity continued so till this *Herod* an *Idumean* was made King by the *Roman Senate*.

a 1 Chr. 3. In this Genealogy ⁿ *Jeboabaz* the First-born of *Josiah* reigning
 15. but three Months is omitted. His Brother ^o *Jeboiakim* succeeded,
 o 2 Chr. 36. but is here left out *incuriâ Amanuensium*. This Man's Son ^p *Je-*
 5. *boiachin* succeeds, called *Coniab* and *Jechoniah*, and with that left
 p Jer. 22. out makes the last 14 Generations. For why should *David* be
 24. reckon'd (by this Author) twice at the end of the first *Tessara-*
 1 Chr. 3. 16. *decade*, and *Josias* but once at the conclusion of the next: since
 there is not the least interruption from the Captivity (as he pre-
 tends.) For v. 11. *Josias* begat *Jechonias* and his Brethren, about
 the time they were carried away to *Babylon*, And after they were
 brought to *Babylon* (the same) *Jechonias* begat *Salathiel*, &c. And
 from *David* to the Captivity, or to *Jechonias* who was then car-
 ried away in it, is all one.

The 17th Proposition is to shew that S. *Luke's* Genealogy is entirely different from S. *Matthew's*, from the Days of *David*. Now on the other side, we suppose the Houses of *Solomon* and *Nathan* were after this united, because it is said that *Salathiel* begat *Zorubbabel* in both Genealogies, and we do not see but that they were the same Persons. But in answer to this, his learned Friend has furnished him with the Interpretation of a Propheſie, *Zech. 12. 10, 14.* where the Family of the House of *David* is represented as mourning for the Murder of their Messiah, and the Family of the House of *Nathan*, and the Family of the House of *Levi*, and the Family of *Shimei*. What then? We know that these were the Names of some of our Saviour's Progenitors: but not, why these should be literally meant above all the rest, as this learned Friend and *Tirinus* before him suppose. And therefore it is more likely that the chief of the People are here understood, viz. The Royal Family by the House of *David*, all the Prophets by the House of *Nathan*, the Priests and *Levites* by the House of *Levi*, and the Scribes and Doctors by the Family of *Shimei*, whose Tribe was the great Nursery of them, or it may mean some other Eminent Doctor of that Name, of which there were many.
 But

But saith he, ' It is said of the other, the Family of their House ;
 ' but of *Shimei*, the Family only ; because this was spoken in the
 ' time of *Shimei*, whilst his Family was of the same Household
 ' with him, and consequently shew him to be contemporary with
 ' the Prophet, and *S. Matthews Zorubbabel* the Leader of the *Jews*.
 If so, then this *Shimei* was different from him, whom *S. Luke*
 places five Generations after *Zorubbabel*: For why he and his
 Father should be different from those in *S. Matthew* I see not. But
 observe, how *subtly* this *metaphysical* Friend distinguishes betwixt
 the Family of *Shimei*, and the Family of the House of *Shimei* ;
 as if one should distinguish between the Family of *Bourbon*, and
 the Family of the House of *Bourbon*, which others might call
Fargon ; but I could not forbear saying, It is neither more nor less
 than downright perfect Nonsense. However what can we be sure of
 from Prophecies and Visions which are not Historical Relations of
 present times ?

The 19th Proposition says, That our Saviour and the gene-
 rality of the *Jews* eat the Passover at the most usual time, the
 Evening after the 14th Day of *Nisan* ; yet that the *Jewish San-*
bedrin, or at least a great part of them defer'd the eating their
 Passover till between Two and Four a Clock the next Morning.
 This was a very unseasonable time, and contrary to the Law of
 God (produced by this Author for this new practice) which bid
 that nothing of it should remain unto the Morning, *Exod. 12. 10.*
 but that they should eat it in the Night before of the 14th Day. ' But
 ' saith he, we are assured by *S. John* that about two in the Morn-
 ' ing, the *Sanbedrin* went not into the Judgment Hall lest they
 ' should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover. Whereas
S. John does not tell us the Clock, but only says, It was early, *i. e.*
 on the next Morning. For it is plain by all the Evangelists that
 they all went home to their Houses after Cock-crowing. For
 after this *S. Matthew* says, *c. 27. 1. When the Morning was come, all the*
chief Priests and the Elders of the People took counsel against Jesus. *S. Mark*
 after he had mentioned that the Cock had crowed the second
 time writes, *c. 15. 1. Straightway in the Morning the chief Priests*
held a consultation. *S. Luke* after the same time says, *c. 22. 66. As*
soon as it was day the Elders of the People and chief Priests, and Scribes
came together. But this Man represents 'em as up all Night.
 ' About two a Clock says he, they go home every one and eat
 ' the Passover. And at four a Clock they meet at the Temple,
 ' and

‘ and then without scruple they enter into the Hall, and converse
 ‘ with the Romans. I am sure this Man talks as if he more than they
 wanted sleep; for the Passover there mentioned by S. John, was
 not of the Paschal Lamb already eaten, but of the Herds that be-
 gan to be offered the following Day, being the first of the Festi-
 val Week of which more presently. Neither came they into the
 Judgment Hall any time after this, during all our Saviour’s tryal.
 For Job. 18. 29. Pilate went out to them and said, What accusation
 bring ye? v. 33. Then Pilate entred into the Judgment Hall again and
 called Jesus. v. 38. Pilate went out again unto the Jews. c. 19. 4.
 Pilate went forth and saith unto them, Behold, I bring him forth to
 you. v. 5. Jesus came forth with his Crown of Thorns. v. 6. When they
 saw him, they cried out, saying, Crucifie him. v. 9. Pilate went again
 into the Judgment Hall, and saith unto Jesus. v. 13. He brought Jesus
 forth and sate down in the Judgment Seat, in a place called the Pav-
 ment. v. 16. Then he delivered him unto them to be crucified. And
 they took Jesus and led him away. I wonder his learned Friend
 did not correct those things for him.

Lastly, Tho’ Good Friday (we know) was the Day before the
 Jews Weekly Sabbath, yet Παρασκευή τῇ Πάσχα, is the Preparation
 of the Passover. For there was a Passover of the Herds, Deut.
 16. 2. And mention is made, 2 Cbr. 30. 24, and 35. 7, 8. of
 Bulls and Oxen for the Passover. But that on the 14th Day
 at Even was to be of Lambs or Kids, Exod. 12. 5. And they
 were the Peace Offerings for the Solemnity of the next Day,
 when the joyful Feastings began and lasted seven Days; the greatest
 part of the Sacrifices returning to the Offerers and their Friends.
 And therefore the words denote, the preparation of Meats to be
 eaten in the Passover Week, as the Preparation of the Sabbath
 was of Provisions for it. Exod. 16. 5, 23. This Friday being the
 first Day of the Passover Week, was also called a Sabbath, as ap-
 pears from Lev. 23. 11. The Bullock eaten on it was called the
 Passover, Job. 18. 28. And the same Day the Preparation of
 the Passover, c. 19. 14. as well as the Lamb on the Evening
 before was. Hence Mat. 28. 1. Ὁ δὲ τῶν σαββάτων is after the
 Sabbaths.

And here I shall take my leave of this Author, till I hear far-
 ther from him.

The POSTSCRIPT.

THIS Postscript no way concerns any part of the foregoing Discourse. But because the Dissenting Ministers do still go on to alledge as one Reason of the continuance of their Nonconformity, ' That they cannot declare their unfeigned Assent and Consent to all, and every thing contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common-Prayer; because the very first Rule in it about the time for keeping *Easter* is often absolutely false, ' was so in the very second Year after the Book was published upon the Restauration, in several Years since, and lately in 1698. And because in the answers returned, by some it is acknowledged to be true, and yet that we may declare our Assent to a falshood of no great moment; by others it is hastily passed over without any *clear satisfaction* what they mean: That we may ~~never~~ hear more of any such Objections against the Common-Prayer-Book for the future, or be unprovided of an Answer, These Men ought to know that the Rule which they find fault with, *viz.*

Easter-Day (on which the rest depend) is *always* the first Sunday after the first full Moon, which happens next after the 21st of March. And if the full Moon happens on a Sunday, *Easter-Day* is the Sunday after;

Was established by the Council of Nice, together with an authentick Cycle of New Moons, for the constant keeping of *Easter* throughout the World. This Cycle is the first Column in our Kalendar, and begins with *January* (2, 10, 19, 8, &c.) and was formerly writ in Golden Letters, whence it had the name of the Golden Number. It was made by the best Astronomers of that Age for 19 Years, when the New Moons return near the same time on the same Day, tho' in so many Centuries has now fallen too late for our true New Moons, about four Days and some Hours; but ye is our *certain Rule* still for keeping *Easter*, and we may not only declare our Assent, but *take our Oath* that *Easter Day* falls *exactly* according to the Full Moons that are to direct us in it.

 The Rule lies thus, *Wherever you see the Golden Number for any Year in the said Column, the New Moons are there throughout the Kalendar; count forward to the 15th Day, and you have the Full in any Month for that Year.* Now in the Year 1662, which they object, the Golden Number was 10, which in *March* fell on the 14th Day: Count this 14th for the first, and the Full Moon falls on the 28th following, where the Sunday after was *Easter-Day* that Year. So in 1698 the Golden Number was 8, which fell in *March*, on the 6th Day; but that New Moon coming to its Full on the 20th, and so a Day too soon for this Rule; the next 8 that we find, falls on *April* 5th, whose full happen'd on *April* 19th, in the Week before *Easter-Day*. So in this Year 1703 the Golden Number is 13, which in *March* falls on the 11th Day, but the Full on the 25th the *Thursday* before *Easter*, according to this Rule which *never fails* in any one Year. And therefore when the practice of the whole Church was settled, it was *Schismatically* done in Pope Gregory 13 in order to reform the Kalendar to reduce the Equinoxes, and consequently the Solstices and Lunar Circuits to the State they were in at the *Nicene Council*: and as great a *piece of Ignorance* in Mr. *Baxter*, and his Dissenting Brethren after him, not to know how to look for *Easter Day*, but in their *Almanacks*.



F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

PAg. 29. l. 19. for [the Legendary Stories] read some Passages. l. 32. r. Jude
14. p. 31. l. 12. for [near 1 Year] r. from v. 21. one Year. p. 37. l. 9. r. he
cannot. p. 42. l. 11. r. here write.